AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

New Series—Vol. VIII.—(XVIII.)—June, 1898.—No. 6.

MOUNT ST. MARY'S SEMINARY OF THE WEST.

THE grand pile that now ornaments the western hill overlooking the city of Cincinnati, is the result of the untiring labors of the pioneers, Fenwick and Purcell, and of the fostering care of Archbishop Elder. Its history, with its humble beginnings, its successes, its difficulties and its hopes may prove of some interest to the readers of the Review.

The little grain of mustard seed, which has produced so flourishing a tree, was sown in 1831, when Bishop Fenwick founded the Athenæum, with a view of providing the youth of Cincinnati with a somewhat higher order of education than was supplied in the ordinary curriculum of the schools of sixty years ago. Bishop Fenwick had time only to plant; he had not the satisfaction of seeing the seed take root and spring into life and fruitfulness. He was called to his reward after eleven years spent at the head of the young diocese. Bishop Purcell took up the work in 1833. He soon saw the necessity of providing more priests to attend to the spiritual wants of the vast numbers of immigrants from the different countries of Europe. He needed priests, and he needed efficient priests. For both he looked to a seminary. "To discharge worthily and well," he said, "functions so sublime that the angels themselves were not reputed worthy of them, or entrusted with them, requires no ordinary preparation. And where except in

ecclesiastical seminaries, can this training be had?" Taking advantage of the Athenæum, the legacy left him by his saintly predecessor, he began at once to enlarge its scope and make it the beginning of the diocesan Seminary, and what was intended for the intellectual culture of the young men of the day, became the training school of the future priests of the States of Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois and Michigan. Classes of philosophy, theology and Scripture were added to the collegiate curriculum. The Rev. James J. Mullen was made the first president. After one year's work of this kind, Father Mullen left Cincinnati to assume charge of St. Patrick's Church, New Orleans, and Bishop Purcell took charge of the infant institution himself, devoting what time was left him after discharging the duties of his episcopal office, to the work of teaching the classes in the Seminary. Although the young Bishop loved the work of teaching, for which he was so well fitted, he was compelled after a year's experience, to give it up, owing to the growing needs of his diocese; and Father Jamison was placed in charge of the Athenæum. The new president soon discovered the necessity of making a separation between the seminarians and the collegians. While both sets of students could attend the same classes in the collegiate courses, it was necessary to give special attention to the spiritual training of the aspirants to the priesthood. The institution was then divided into two departments. The Athenæum and the Seminary of St. Francis Xavier were the names by which the two departments were distinguished. Under the direction of Father Jamison both classes of students received the training suited to their different states of life. The first fruits of St. Francis' Seminary was the Rev. Damien Juncker who was ordained priest. After many years of seminary work in the diocese, he received a deserved promotion by being made first Bishop of the now flourishing See of Alton.

The rapid growth of Cincinnati brought with it an inconvenience. The bustle and turmoil of city life were looked upon as hindrances to the quiet of study and recollection,

both so necessary to seminary training. Bishop Purcell transferred the Seminary from the Athenæum to St. Martin's, Brown County, Ohio, a most beautiful location, now the site of the Academy of Ursuline Nuns. The land was donated for educational purposes to Bishop Fenwick by General Lytle, in 1823. The students arrived at their country home in the September of 1839, and were lodged in a small house built by Father Reed. The Rev. J. J. O'Mealy was appointed first president. He soon enlarged the building to meet the needs of the increasing numbers, and completed a church for the Catholics who had settled on the lands in the neighborhood. In those days the president and professors of the Seminary were obliged to attend both to the training of the students and the spiritual wants of the people, owing to the scarcity of priests. Father O'Mealy continued in charge of the Seminary until 1842, when he resigned to take up parochial work. Unable to spare priests from the work of the missions in the diocese, Bishop Purcell now sought the aid of the religious orders. The Lazarists of Missouri in answer to his appeal, sent Fathers F. Burlando and Chas. Boglioli, to whom the seminarians were given in charge.

The roll of students at the opening term in 1842 contains the names of J. H. Luers, the first ordained from Brown County Seminary, afterwards first Bishop of Fort Wayne; J. Doherty, Chas Killeen, Timothy Farrell, Philip Foley, Daniel Hallinan, Cornelius Daly, Thos. Boulger, Patrick O'Mealy, J. V. Conlon, W. McCallion, Maurice Howard, James Cahill and James Kearney, all of whom became priests.

Another change of location for the Seminary became necessary. St. Martin's afforded all the seclusion that could be desired, but it had its drawbacks also. It was too far from Cincinnati, forty miles, a short distance indeed as we travel now, but in those days it meant a day's journey. The stage coach or a private conveyance was the only choice given to the traveller. The diocesan Seminary and the Cathedral should be close neighbors. The Bishop who has his Seminary near his Cathedral, can, with little difficulty, give his attention to it, and have at hand the students and professors,

who can help in carrying out all the ceremonies of the Church. The long journey between Cincinnati and St. Martin's was a source of inconvenience. The students were sent down to the city for Holy Week services, and other important ecclesiastical functions; but it was a break in the routine of seminary life which had its drawbacks. After six years' experience the Bishop concluded to make a change and bring the students back to the city. In 1845, when the students returned they were located in the novitiate attached to the Jesuit College on Sycamore street, and placed under the direction of Father Nota, an eminent Jesuit theologian. The Seminary continued under his direction until after the consecration of the new Cathedral, which was completed in 1845. The Bishop removed from Sycamore street to the new episcopal residence on Central avenue and West Eighth street. The rapid increase of the number of students in the Jesuit College necessitated another change, and the seminarians were transferred to the Bishop's residence, under the direction of the Rev. D. Whelan. Here the students became a part of the Bishop's household, Bishop Purcell bestowing upon them his most tender care. When not engaged in the duties of his office, he loved to be with his dear seminarians, to whom he recounted all the experiences of his episcopal visitations, giving lessons which proved most useful to them in their after life on the mission.

While he did all in his power to make the life of the seminarians happy, he always felt that the condition could only be temporary, and he longed for the time and the means to found a worthy seminary. In good time God heard the Bishop's prayer and filled the hearts of the Catholics of Cincinnati with something of the Bishop's own generosity. After fourteen years of waiting and longing, the good Bishop was filled with joy, when, on opening his mail on January 21, 1847, he found a letter from Messrs. Slevin Bros., then prosperous merchants of Cincinnati, authorizing him to draw on them to the amount of ten thousand dollars to found a diocesan Seminary. A week later came the offer of the Consadine Bros. to donate five

acres as a site for the Seminary. This tract of land, located on Price Hill, to the west of Cincinnati, was in every way suitable for a seminary, combining the retirement and the quiet of the country with the advantage of closeness to the city above which it stands several hundred feet. With these generous donations Bishop Purcell felt justified in making the beginning of the home for the seminarians. With the early spring the work of grading the grounds and digging the foundation was under way, and the construction of the main building, eighty feet square and four stories high, was started, the Slevin Bros. having generously increased their first offer to an amount sufficient to complete the building. The corner-stone was laid by Bishop Purcell on July 19, 1848, the feast of St. Vincent de Paul. The work on the building was pushed so rapidly that in a few months the foundations and walls of the new home of learning—Mt. St. Mary's of the West—were completed.

The regular retreat of that year was conducted by Bishop Whelan, of Richmond. The Bishop brought the subject of the Seminary to the attention of the priests. His words fell on willing ears; and they unanimously agreed to tax themselves for an annual contribution, and advised a yearly collection to be taken up in all the parishes of the diocese. To bring this important matter to the attention of the laity, the Bishop published an earnest pastoral letter. It had the desired effect. The people of the diocese recognized the need of the new work of their Bishop and the contributions of the clergy and laity, added to the generous donations of the Messrs. Slevins and Consadines, enabled him to complete the building. The Bishop's next concern was to provide professors. His first thought was the seminary specialists, the Sulpicians, under whom he himself had been trained in ecclesiastical life. That Order was unable to give him the assistance he sought; and he was obliged to select the staff from the priests of the diocese.

The Rev. Michael Hallinan, D. D., who had just returned from St. Sulpice where he had completed his theological

course, was named Rector. He was assisted by Father David Whelan. Classes of philosophy and theology were organized. Of the students who formed the first classes at the opening of the Seminary, all have passed to their reward except two, the Rev. James O'Donohue, now pastor of St. Edward's Church, Cincinnati, and the Rev. David Walker, who, after serving many years in the diocese, joined the sons of Loyola and is now doing good service in the city of New York. Father Francis J. Pabisch, of the University of Vienna, and Father Jeremiah O'Connor were added to the faculty, which was further strengthened by the arrival of Dr. Rosecrans who had completed his course with great honor at the Propaganda, Rome. At the close of the scholastic year 1853–54, Dr. Hallinan resigned the rectorship and was succeeded by the Rev. John Quinlan, who retained his position until his elevation to the See of Mobile. He became professor of moral theology; Dr. Rosecrans continued professor of dogma, and the Rev. A. M. Toebbe, afterward Bishop of Covington, taught philosophy and Sacred Scripture. On May 13, 1855, the first Provincial Council of Cincinnati was opened. The prelates present were: the Most Rev. Archbishop Purcell, the Rt. Rev. Bishops Lefevre, of Detroit, Rappe, of Cleveland, Spalding, of Louisville, De St. Palais, of Vincennes, Carrell, of Covington, Baraga, Vicar Apostolic of the Peninsula of Michigan. Of the decrees enacted the first and most important which occupied the minds of the Fathers had for their object the training of a pious and learned priesthood for the work of the ministry. To this purpose six of the decrees were devoted. They call to mind in the words of the Council of Trent the care that bishops should take to promote to Sacred Orders none but men of approved piety and learning, and to subject them when invested with the pastoral ministry to examinations as to their fitness for the office whenever they judge necessary. In addition to provisions already made for ecclesiastical studies in the various dioceses, it was thought advisable to have two seminaries, one for the preparatory course and one for philosophy and theology, established for the whole Pro-

vince. St. Thomas' Seminary of the Diocese of Louisville, was selected as the Preparatory Seminary and Mt. St. Mary's as the Theological Seminary of the Province. The decree concerning Mt. St. Mary's is as follows: "Cum innotuisset Patribus deesse in plerisque Seminariis Dioecesanis tum copiam quae decet magistrorum, tum numerum alumnorum ad alendam aemulationem in studiis scientiae et pietatis necessarium, placuit omnibus Seminarium commune pro universa Provincia instituere, Seminariis Dioecesanis tamen minime sublatis; aedemque Seminarii Sanctae Mariae ad Montes prope urbem Cincinnatensem, munificentissime a Reverendissimo ac Illustrissimo D. D. Archiepiscopo Cincinnatensi oblatam, eligere in situm novi instituti."

To carry out this decree a committee of the Prelates of the Council and a number of laymen were appointed for the government of the new Provincial Seminary. This committee organized under the laws of Ohio and obtained a charter. The Archbishop of Cincinnati, and the Bishops of Louisville, Cleveland, Vincennes and Covington, were selected as the episcopal committee. After a thorough examination into the working of the Seminaries, the course of study, discipline, etc., the committee decided to make no change, as all were satisfied that in those things the Seminary was all that could be desired. The Committee also reappointed the faculty of the preceding year. The Seminary continued thus the Theological Seminary of the Province for many years. While Archbishop Purcell was providing for the training of the young men whom he found divinely called to the sacred ministry, he saw that his diocese needed also a home of learning for young men who, if they had the opportunity to fit themselves properly for it, would in future do good service for religion in the ranks of the laity. With the proper education and training the young men of the rising generation could enter the various professions and take with them the sound principles of Catholic faith. Thus the force of Catholic truth would in time make itself felt in all stations of life. So thought the Archbishop and he determined to make the trial. He decided to add to

the Theological Seminary a collegiate department. To carry out this design it became necessary to enlarge the building. The main building, erected through the generosity of the Slevins and Consadines, was barely sufficient to accommodate the students of philosophy and theology. The Archbishop began the erection of the south wing. His intention was to carry out the plan of Mt. St. Mary's, Emmittsburg, having the college classes taught by the advanced seminarians. The work was started in the spring of 1856. The south wing was built and also the chapel of St. John the Baptist—one generous Catholic giving five thousand dollars and another one thousand dollars to aid in the erection of the chapel. Thus encouraged, the Archbishop prosecuted the work so earnestly as to have everything in readiness for the laying of the corner-stone before the close of the scholastic year of 1855-56. The Rev. James Wood, afterwards Archbishop of Philadelphia, was delegated by His Grace to perform the ceremony on June 22, 1856.

The Seminary and College at last became a reality. On August 31, 1856, the Seminary session began by an eight days' retreat conducted by Bishop De Goesbriand, of Burlington, Vt. The College department was opened on September 15. The Rev. Dr. Rosecrans was appointed president, and the Rev. John Quinlan rector of the Seminary. Most of the professors were graduates of Mount St. Mary's, Emmittsburg ; the course of studies, discipline and rules introduced by the saintly founders of that institution, with such improvements as the times required, were adopted by St. Mary's of the West.

It was during the first session of the new College that Fathers James Wood and Damien Juncker, two of Cincinnati's priests, were consecrated respectively Bishops of Philadelphia and Alton, April 26, 1857. The first College Commencement took place June 24, 1857. On the same day the now completed chapel of St. John the Baptist was dedicated, the Very Rev. E. L. Collins, V. G., performing the ceremony and celebrating Solemn Mass. The chapel was of

Gothic style, and measured ninety feet by thirty. The ornamental paintings and beautiful frescoes were the work of Cincinnati's artist, Tanthrop. The beautiful stained glass window representing Herodias receiving the head of St. John the Baptist from Herod was transferred from the old chapel to the new chapel. The altar-piece, representing the Baptism of our Lord, was a gift from Dr. Pabisch. The chapel afterwards received a precious gift from the Archbishop—the body of St. Flavian, martyr, which was placed in a shrine in the front of the altar.

In May, 1858, the Seminary and College were honored by a visit from the Prelates attending the Second Provincial Council of Cincinnati. They were entertained by the students with literary and musical exercises. Bishop Spalding, in the name of the visiting Prelates, was pleased to express his approbation of the efforts of the students and to exhort them to "that robust, intelligent and energetic faith, which is to the world the most convincing proof of the truth of religion, because in the loving evidence that they who choose God for their portion knowing all sides of the question there is an unanswerable rebuke to that pride which foolishly despises the Cross." The Prelates also examined the theologians on the tract *De Justitia et Jure*, which was the class matter of the year. So pleased were they with the results of their visit that in the next session of the Council a commission of four, consisting of the Most Rev. Archbishop and the Bishops of Louisville, Detroit and Covington, was appointed to assist twice a year at the theological exercises of the students of the Provincial Seminary. During this session the faculty was strengthened by the addition of a number of distinguished professors. The Rev. S. H. Rosecrans, D.D., President of the College and Professor of Dogmatic Theology; the Rev. John Quinlan, Rector of the Seminary and Professor of Moral Theology and Liturgy; the Rev. F. Goetz, Professor of Church History and Principal of the German Department; Xavier Donald McLeod, Principal of the Department of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres; Charles O'Leary, Principal of the Classical Department and Professor

of Chemistry and Geology; E. P. J. Scammon, of West Point Military Academy, Principal of the Mathematical Department, and the Rev. William Barry, who had completed his studies in Rome, was assigned to the Classical Department.

While everything was running along smoothly in the College and Seminary, helped on by the zeal of the professors and the good-will of the students, the Archbishop was much exercised in finding means to meet the expenses. People are usually enthusiastic when great things are begun, but that spirit, like the seed falling upon the rocky ground, grows awhile and then is apt to die down. All were loud in their praise of the Archbishop when he started the work, but soon they lost sight of the need of giving him material help. He was obliged, year after year, to remind them of their duty in this regard. This year he published another pastoral appealing to the faithful of the diocese for needed assistance. By his invitation Bishop Spalding, of Louisville, preached an eloquent sermon in the Cathedral, May 13th, on the subject of seminaries. He explained the decrees of the Council of Trent imposing on the Bishops the duty of founding and maintaining seminaries, and showed also how that duty can be performed only by the assistance of the faithful. The following extracts will give a good idea of the Bishop's learned discourse on seminaries: "In our country and times circumstances are widely different from those which surround our European brethren, for whom the canon of the Council of Trent is fully available in practice, at least in its substantial provisions. That law supposes the beneficiary system, or the system of endowed churches and institutions. In our country the only resource of the Church is the living faith and charity of the people. Catholic hearts must yield the tribute which cannot come from any other quarter; the spirit must be the mint from which the means of carrying on God's work may be coined. You know, brethren, that without the priesthood religion could not exist among you. Take away the priest and the lights must be extinguished from the altar, the newly-born must remain unregenerate, the sick and dying must fold their hands and suffer and die alone, unshriven and

unconsoled; the Sacraments could no longer be administered, and the people of Christ must be as the heathen. Now take away the ecclesiastical seminary and you annihilate the priesthood, if not for yourselves, at least for your children. The people need the priesthood far more than do the living priests who appeal to you for its support. These desire its perpetuation, not for themselves, but for you. They desire its increase, not to add to their own importance, but to gather in and save the souls that are constantly perishing for the want of pastoral care. In our vast country, Catholics, young, middle-aged and old, are scattered among Protestants and are dying in sin, without the Sacraments, for want of priests. Twice as many zealous priests as we have at present could be employed to-morrow. We cannot have them, we dare not undertake to prepare them, because our means are slender, and withal precarious and uncertain, depending upon chance alms and occasional collections. Why do not Catholics come forward and endow our seminaries, or at least some of our professors? Protestants find no difficulty in endowing their institutions. In Kentucky and elsewhere in this country any one of the sects can raise one, two or three thousand dollars for any one of their institutions they may deem it expedient to endow. Is heresy more open-handed than truth? Are the children of darkness to be more zealous and more munificent than the children of light? Among our good works there is none half so important as that connected with founding and adequately supporting ecclesiastical seminaries. Other charities are more or less local, this is world-wide and Catholic; others are to a greater or less extent temporary, this is permanent, for the priesthood must last until the consummation of the world. Its continuance is essential to the very existence of the Church. Our seminaries are supported from year to year by such offerings as the charity of the faithful may make, and though our faithful Catholic people are proverbially generous and charitable, yet it is sad, indeed, that so important and vital an interest as that connected with the perpetuation and increase of our priesthood should depend wholly on mere

casual contributions, which many may neglect to make. Our seminaries should be endowed, and we hope the time is not far distant when this good work will be accomplished."

The promotion of the Rev. John Quinlan to the See of Mobile, December 4, 1859, made a change in the faculty necessary. The vacancy was filled by the appointment of the youthful Father Barry to the rectorship of the Seminary. The faculty as newly constituted consisted of Dr. Rosecrans, President of the College and Professor of Dogma; Father Barry, Rector of the Seminary and Professor of Moral Theology; the Rev. D. B. Walker, Procurator and Professor of Liturgy; Mr. Weisel, Professor of Music; Messrs. McLeod, O'Leary and Scammon retaining their former positions. This staff continued without change in Mt. St. Mary's until the outbreak of the Civil War.

On December 23, 1861, Dr. Rosecrans, who had so long guided Mt. St. Mary's in her advancing course, was appointed Bishop of Pomperopolis *in partibus infidelium* and auxiliary Bishop of Cincinnati. It was indeed a source of joy to all concerned with Mt. St. Mary's to have their worthy president so highly honored, but to many it seemed full of danger to the institution. His duties as Bishop would certainly interfere with his labors in the Seminary, if, indeed, it did not put an end to his connection with it. His consecration took place on March 25, 1862. At the close of the scholastic year, June 25, 1862, Bishop Rosecrans resigned the presidency of the College, and Father Barry had to assume the office. The session which opened September, 1862, with the brightest prospects was one of disaster to Mt. St. Mary's. Early in the session Father Barry showed signs of failing health. He had the double burden of the College and the Seminary and this proved too much for his frail constitution. He was compelled to give up his work, his friends hoped only temporarily, but their hopes were not realized. On April 20, 1863, Father Barry, amid the lamentations of the students who had loved him so well, yielded his great and pious soul into the hands of his Master.

The outbreak of the war produced the same effects here as it did with other places of learning. Very few students of the College returned after the close of the session 1862-63. The Archbishop found it impossible to provide professors. The war not only kept students from the College but it also took professors away. Charles O'Leary entered the army as a surgeon ; E. P. Scammon joined the forces as a lieutenant, winning the rank of major-general before the close of the war. Dr. Pabisch took the chair of Dogmatic Theology and Father Corcoran was named rector of the Seminary ; the College department was kept up only in name for the accommodation of some students who could not reach home on account of the war, and a few who lived in the neighborhood of Cincinnati. They attended classes with the seminarians of the preparatory department. From this time until its close in 1879, Mt. St. Mary's became a Preparatory and Theological Seminary. Soon after the opening of the College department, the Archbishop found it an advantage to have his preparatory students taught at Mt. St. Mary's. He therefore gradually withdrew them from the Barrens, Mo., and St. Thomas', Kentucky. Accommodating himself to the new order of things, the Archbishop had the satisfaction of seeing the Seminary open with very bright prospects in the September of 1863. The Seminary was in excellent condition. Dr. Pabisch assumed the chair of Moral Theology and Bishop Rosecrans took up again the duties of Professor of Dogmatic Theology. Dr. O'Regan, having returned from Rome, was added to the staff. The Rev. Xavier Donald McLeod, who had been ordained priest, continued as Professor of Latin and Belles Lettres ; the Rev. M. Ahern, Professor of Liturgy.

Everything gave evidence of a bright future, and the Archbishop had begun to realize the fruit of his past labors. But, alas! this beloved labor of his life, the climax of his self-sacrificing zeal, of his hopes and prayers, was almost completely obliterated by fire on October 20, 1863. Some repairs were being made on the chapel roof and when the Angelus rang at noon the tinners came down for dinner, leaving their

fire-pot on the roof. It is supposed that some sparks falling ignited the woodwork of the roof. The students had just left the refectory after dinner and had made their usual thanksgiving in the chapel, when the sudden shrill cry of fire was heard. On reëntering the chapel a small blaze was seen in the highest point of the ceiling. It was impossible to reach the spot, and it soon became evident that the chapel could not be saved. The students then went to work with a will to save the wing which connected the chapel with the main building. A hand engine from the foot of the hill was all that could be had; that was dragged up and put to work. It was impossible to save the wing. The main building was finally saved. Of the wing and chapel nothing remained but the walls. The Blessed Sacrament, sacred vessels and vestments were saved, as was also the altar-piece; everything else in the chapel disappeared in the wreck. Happily the damage was in a great measure covered by insurance and the work of reconstruction was begun at once, the students themselves doing the work of clearing off the debris. Studies were resumed as soon as possible after the fire, the students and professors submitting cheerfully to the inconveniences of their now crowded quarters. On account of the retirement of Bishop Rosecrans and Father McLeod a new staff of professors was appointed: The Rev. F. J. Pabisch, Rector; the Rev. D. O'Regan, D.D., Vice-Rector; the Revv. Jos. Fitzgerald and James F. Callaghan. Although the insurance covered, in a great measure, the damage done the building, the Archbishop had to provide for supplying the losses not so covered. His appeal to the priests and people produced good results and the restoration was made with only a small debt. The rebuilt chapel was dedicated on December 8, 1864. Dr. O'Regan was obliged to retire on account of ill-health, and J. Fitzgerald returning to parish work, the Revv. H. J. Richter, D.D., now Bishop of Grand Rapids, and P. A. Quinn were selected to fill their places.

Gradually the signs of the fire began to disappear and the Seminary to recover from its almost disastrous effects. The opening of the session of September, 1865, found the Semi-

nary full of students. It became necessary to increase the faculty in order to do justice to the increased number of students. The Revv. Richard Gilmour, afterwards Bishop of Cleveland, J. H. Bonner and Engbers were added to the staff. The number of students still increasing, the enlargement of the building became a necessity. It was then decided to build the northern wing, thus completing the original plan of the Seminary. The corner-stone of this addition was laid by the Archbishop, October 31, 1869, the thirty-sixth anniversary of his consecration and the eve of his departure for Rome to attend the Vatican Council. The ceremony was witnessed by nearly all the priests of the diocese, who had come to say good-bye to His Grace before his departure for the Holy City. The new addition was completed and ready for the opening of the session in September, 1870. The faculty was composed of the following: The Revv. F. J. Pabisch, D.D., P. H. Cusack, H. J. Richter, D.D., Thos. S. Byrne, D.D., E. Hecht, D.D., B. H. Engbers, Ph. D., Peter Geyer, D.D., W. J. Murray, M.D.

With the completion of the northern wing it was hoped that the Seminary had reached the end of expenditure for building, but not so. It was found on examination that the chapel, which had been restored after the fire, was in an unsafe condition. The fire had done damage which only became apparent with time. It was taken down and rebuilt in the condition in which it now stands at a cost of $25,000. It was dedicated on the feast of the translation of the Holy House of Loretto, December 14, 1871. The history of the Seminary is one of increasing success; each session added to the number of students and each year the Archbishop saw the fruit of his sowing in the priests the Seminary furnished the diocese. This series of successful years came to an end in 1879, when financial disasters in the diocese compelled the Archbishop to close the Seminary.

Mt. St. Mary's of the West was closed. The students and professors departed; the windows were shut; the doors were locked and the home of piety and learning was left to

slumber after a happy existence of thirty-one years. The grounds were deserted; the halls no longer rang with the merry laughter of the students, and the joyful chimes of the bell in the cupola at last were silent at the Angelus hour. The blow fell heavily on all. Dr. Pabisch went out from what he looked upon as his home with a broken heart; he died shortly after. The professors were assigned to parochial work in the different parts of the diocese, and the students were sent to the different seminaries of the country to complete their unfinished courses. The venerable Archbishop retired to the shades of St. Martin's, Brown County, the site of the first Seminary, bowed down with years and sorrow. His death, which occurred four years after, was as quiet and peaceful as his life had been pure and simple. Only a few minutes before he breathed his last he took Father Callaghan's hand and gazed upon him with a smile of unutterable love. Then he closed his eyes, and in a little while the spirit had fled to God, whom he had so devotedly loved and served. Men die but the Church lives on her undying life.

Archbishop Purcell felt the need of help in the last years of his life. He asked for and obtained a Coadjutor worthy of himself, in the person of the Right Rev. William Henry Elder, of Natchez, who came to Cincinnati in April, 1880. Many cares faced the Bishop, but he entered upon his work with an earnestness and zeal which must in the end obtain success. Amid all the difficulties that surrounded him, Archbishop Elder never lost sight of the Seminary, and never gave up the idea of reopening Mt. St. Mary's. The prospect was indeed gloomy. The clouds of the great failure darkened the horizon, and the devising of means to satisfy the clamoring creditors and the administration of the Archdiocese were a heavy burden to the new Archbishop. The only definite request that Archbishop Purcell ever made was that the "Old Mount", the institution of his love, the home where his children with smiling faces had always greeted him, among whom he loved to linger, be opened. Archbishop Elder longed for the means to gratify

this last request of one who had been a father to himself, as well as to the vast diocese now committed to his care. Yet the outlook was discouraging. He could scarcely obtain sufficient resources to pay the tuition of his students in the seminaries of other dioceses. How could he then face the extra outlay of maintaining a seminary of his own? The darkest hour is just before the dawn. So, too, when the shadows of discouragement were densest the light began to shine. Mr. R. R. Springer, who had been in lifetime a most generous benefactor of the Seminary, did not forget that institution in his will. Among other munificent charitable bequests, he left to Archbishop Elder the sum of one hundred thousand dollars for the Seminary. Now the Archbishop was in a position to gratify his own desire and carry out the wish of his illustrious predecessor. Mt. St. Mary's could now start anew on her career of usefulness for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, and take up her traditions of the past and expand under happier auspices in the future.

No time was lost in setting the house in order for the reception of students. To do this required labor and money. The venerable pile showed the ravages of the few years in which it had been left without attention. After an expenditure of eighteen thousand dollars, the grand old institution was placed in a condition to welcome back the professors and students upon whom she had to close her doors eight years before. The Very Rev. Thos. S. Byrne, one of the old faculty, was appointed rector. Associated with him were the Rev. E. Hecht, D.D., also one of the old faculty, and the Rev. E. Sele, D.D. It was decided by the Most Rev. Archbishop to open the Seminary only to students of Philosophy and Theology.

The evening of September 12, 1887, found the halls of Mt. St. Mary's of the West filled with a new generation of levites; the old corridors resounded again with the cheering welcome of meeting friends; the institution took upon itself the look of former days, and all was in readiness for the continuance of that noble mission for which it had been

destined by its venerable and lamented founder. The scholastic year began with a spiritual retreat of seven days, conducted by the Rev. H. Schapman, S.J. Solemn Pontifical Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Elder, on September 20. Besides the members of the faculty many of the clergy were present. Thus, after eight years of silence, the regular work of study was resumed. From small beginnings the able and efficient administration of Dr. Byrne brought the Seminary to the high state of excellence it enjoys to-day. He continued at the head of the institution until he was called to the government of the diocese of Nashville, July 25, 1894. Opening with twenty-five students, the number increased so rapidly that it became necessary to add a new wing. This great improvement met with the hearty approval of Archbishop Elder. The addition was completed at a cost of forty thousand dollars, and makes Mt. St. Mary's one of the best appointed seminaries in the country. The solemn dedication took place on March 7, 1895, the feast of St. Thomas. Archbishop Elder performed the ceremony. Bishops Maes, Byrne and others were present on the occasion. Such is the history of the first seminary founded in the West. It stands the enduring monument of the zeal and devotion of the three great Prelates of Cincinnati, Fenwick, Purcell and Elder.

The present faculty of the Seminary is composed of the Very Rev. John B. Murray, President, the Rev. Egidius Sele, D.D., Vice-President, and the Revv. Bernard Feeney, Bernhard F. Kuhlmann, D.D., Louis Nau, and there are about a hundred and fifty students in the different classes.

Besides the Seminary proper the diocese supports also St. Gregory's Preparatory Seminary, Cedar Point, Hamilton County, where ninety-five junior students are presently taught.

SAINT FRANCIS DE SALES AS A SPIRITUAL DIRECTOR.

OF all the parts of the mission of St. Francis de Sales that which represents him as a director in the spiritual life was the chief. He was a model of sanctity, an apostolic Bishop, a founder of a great Order, a preacher of the highest rank, an incomparable spiritual writer, but in all this and above all this he was a guide of souls. "His vocation in the Church," says his friend André de Sauzéa, Bishop of Bethlehem, "was chiefly that of a great confessor." In his youth, in his very childhood, this character of director or counsellor appeared, mingled with an ingenuous simplicity which forbade all suspicion of sanctimoniousness. It was the result of a nature tending essentially to communication, of faith equivalent to sight, of charity already touching on the heroic. He was scarcely ordained priest (1593) when he was recognized as the universal master of consciences, from that of the future President of Savoy, Antoine Favre, to that of the humblest and vilest first-comer. In the Chablain his mission was quite as much that of the monitor as of preacher.

But it was on the great stage of Paris, in 1602, that the Bishop-elect of Geneva first appeared as a chief director in an age of admirable directors. Two testimonies will be enough. "There used to be held at this time," says George Roland, the attendant of the Saint, afterwards Canon of Geneva, "certain meetings of devout persons in the house of M. Acarie; they invited the servant of God to be their spiritual father." M^me^ Acarie was to become Blessed Mary of the Incarnation; the "devout persons" were such as De Bérulle and Du Val. The translator (A. D. S.) of the edition of the *Spiritual Combat* of 1608, probably the Bishop named above, addresses the saint thus in his dedication, referring to this period of Paris: "I consider that you are principally appointed by God for the salvation of those who confide in you. Perfect in rectitude yourself, you form, guide and correct all who apply to you as they ought."

From such beginnings we can argue the continuation, particularly after the publication of *The Devout Life*, and in proportion as the wisdom and charitable devotedness of the saintly pontiff became more widely known. At Annecy, at Grenoble, at Paris during his second visit (1618, 1619,) he passed a considerable part of each day in the confessional, receiving by preference the lowly and the neglected. He tells us that he was obliged to give up visits of friendship on account of the concourse of penitents, and that he was obliged to stay up far into the early hours of the morning in order to answer the letters of those at a distance. François Favre, one of his attendants, deposes that there were few days on which he had not to seal twenty or twenty-five of these missives. Louis de Genève counted forty freshly-written letters on his table one morning. Roland speaks of fifty on another occasion. In all the towns through which he passed, troubled souls and the most enlightened confessors were waiting to consult him. Fr. Coton, confessor of Henry IV. and of the court, declared that he could not decide a certain difficult case and that the Bishop of Geneva was in his opinion the only one competent to do so. Fr. Suffren, that director "so profound and enlightened," as St. Jane Frances styles him, declared that he learnt more as to the guidance of souls in one conference (of nine hours, it is true) with our saint than in all the rest of his life.

This prodigious reputation has been more than confirmed by succeeding ages. "As director of souls," says Bossuet to the Sisters of the Visitation, "your founder is truly sublime." Bourdaloue lays down that to "form the moral character of the faithful, no one has had the same gift as the Bishop of Geneva." St. Alphonsus points out that the Church makes us pray "to be directed by his instructions;" and in our own day the decree of Doctorate has put the seal on this teaching, assuring us that our new Doctor "draws out the highest principles of the science of the Saints and puts them in so clear a light that it is evidently his special privilege to have applied them wisely and sweetly to all conditions of the faithful."

Let us now see where the principles of this direction are to be found. Chiefly in five works or groups of works. *The Devout Life* is a first manual of them, written expressly for the purpose. The author continually recommends it to his penitents as the sum of his ascetic teachings and fruit of his experience. The *Treatise on the Love of God* is as it were the second volume of this work, forming part of the original design of one complete manual of spirituality, treating of the highest operations of the spirit in prayer and in the practice of the virtues, and founded equally, says the Saint, "on my experience in the conduct of souls." The third and fourth sources of instruction are the *Sermons* (including the *Conferences*) and the *Opuscules*. Amongst the latter we may specify: 1. *Instructions for Confessors*, the publication of which was the first act of the Saint's episcopate; 2. a remarkable fragment on the virtues; 3. a long examination of conscience; 4. *Rules for the Discernment of Spirits*.

But the *Letters* are the most abundant, and after *The Devout Life* the most important store-house of information on the system of St. Francis de Sales. Here are found not only his general theory but also the closest application of it to individual souls, souls of so many types and of such varied surroundings that it would be hard indeed to fail in finding the precise teachings needed. The present writer has translated into English two volumes of these memorials,[1] but the bulk is only to be found in French, and the collection will not be entire until the appearance of the Annecy edition of this correspondence, which is just being begun and will form volumes XI. to XVI. of the *Œuvres Complètes*.

Various authors have given abstracts of these principles, the most useful to our mind being from Fr. Caussin, S.J., author of the *Holy Court*, in his *Conduite Spirituelle Selon l'Esprit de S. François de Sales*, Paris, 1636. We may name also the *Advis Chrestiens* of Fr. Dagonel, S.J., and the *Regulae Salesianae* founded on these *Advis;* also the *Directeur*

1 *Letters to Persons in the World* and *Letters to Persons in Religion:* Burns and Oates, London; Benziger Bros., New York.

spirituel tiré des Escrits du B. F. de Sales, published at Rheims in 1634, perhaps under the inspiration of the great English Benedictine Archbishop, a personal friend of the Saint. Finally we may mention the little work *Vraie et solide piété expliquée par S. François de Sales*, by Collot, Paris, 1728, which is represented in English by a volume called *Practical Piety*. The fault of this selection is that it presents as the Saint's full system what are only extracts from his Conferences and Letters.

It is not our intention to treat the above-named ascetic teaching in itself. We speak of the holy Doctor's principles *on* direction, not of the matter of this direction, which we have outlined elsewhere. Fr. Caussin resumes it under the three heads of abnegation or simplicity of heart, holy liberty, sweetness towards our neighbors. These three may be reduced to one, namely, the intense and exclusive clinging to the Will of God, known or to be known. To produce this, according to the dispositions and measure of the penitent, may be called our Saint's first principle in direction. A second follows directly from it, that in going to those who have authority, one goes to God, one asks and learns God's Will, not any human opinion. In the famous chapter "On the Necessity of a Director," the author of *The Devout Life* thus expresses this truth: "Your guide must always be an angel to you, that is, you must not consider him merely as a man, you must not trust in his human knowledge, but in God who will give you His favors and speak to you through this man, putting into his heart and mouth what is necessary for your good." In obeying those who have lawful spiritual authority over you, he says to a young lady whom he was advising as to her vocation, "you cannot err although they may err and advise you badly if they look principally to anything but their spiritual advantage." In other words, advice inopportune in itself would turn to good by means of the good-will of the person who receives it. This truth implies and demands two others: that God has appointed His Church to express His Will and that in this Church the priest is the mouthpiece of this expression. To prove these it is enough

to recall the divine commission: "Teach all nations," "feed My sheep," "he that heareth you heareth Me." St. Francis refers thus to a friend who was about to give up his faith. "This young man writes: 'I give up communion with the Church in order to withdraw to England, whither God calls me.' Alas! who would not mourn over these words, since to separate oneself from the Church is to separate oneself from God!" To the young lady just mentioned he writes: "You think that your desire to enter religion is not according to God's will because it does not agree with the advice of those who have the right to guide you. If you mean, to guide your soul and direct you in spiritual things you are right, but if you mean those whom God has given you for directors in temporal things, you are wrong when you trust them in matters where they have no authority."

The above are the axiomatic bases of all spiritual direction as practised in the Catholic Church, though usefully sought in St. Francis de Sales on account of the lucid and persuasive manner in which he expresses them. Let us proceed to outline his more special views on the utility, functions and qualities of a director, as expressed chiefly in the chapter of *The Devout Life* above quoted and confirmed from his other writings and by his practice.

He begins by insisting on the *necessity* of a director, which he calls his "admonition of admonitions." He adopts the declaration made by Blessed John of Avila to his spiritual daughter: "Nowhere else will you find so assuredly the Will of God as in the way of humble obedience." This is specially true for women who, according to St. Francis,[1] "are subject since the creation to the condition of obedience." Our saintly author supports this contention by the example of innumerable saints, specially of St. Teresa, to whom the superiority of such submission over voluntary austerities was warranted by a direct revelation. It is opportune to recall this doctrine of the prince of directors in this age of liberty, and it must be remembered that he carefully distinguishes the office of the director from that of the confessor, while,

1 *Letters to Persons in Religion*, Book I., Let. 1.

of course, admitting that the two offices may be usefully combined in the same person. The confessor as such is bound only to know specific faults and give such counsels as are necessary for absolution. The director, or the confessor inasmuch as he is director, should know everything that regards the soul. And this brings us to the question of the office of the spiritual guide and the immediate scope of his efforts.

The functions then of the director may be summed up in enlightening, admonishing and encouraging or consoling. In our chapter, the great Master says in his poetical way, commenting on the words of the Sage about the "faithful friend," that our spiritual father "guides our actions by his counsels, protects us from the snares of the evil one, is a treasure of wisdom in our afflictions, troubles and falls, a medicine for our hearts in spiritual maladies." "Manifest therefore," he says further on, "clearly to him your good and your evil; your good will be examined and assured, your bad corrected and remedied; you will be relieved and strengthened in your afflictions, moderated and regulated in your consolations." The Saint was careful to put his theory into practice. Fr. Suffren tells us that he saw one of his letters to his Jesuit director, Fr. Fourier, cousin of the lately canonized Peter Fourier, in which he gave an account of his spiritual life such as a simple novice would render to his superior.

Coming to details, we see that the first care of our Saint was to orientate the soul which recurred to him, to put it in the true way towards God. For this purpose he counselled a general confession or at least a complete manifestation, the object of which was partly to produce a more earnest contrition and solid practical resolutions, partly to explain tendencies, dangers, situation, means, advantages, drawbacks. Then he gave a rule of life in which prayer and the Sacraments as the means of grace were made to harmonize with the other duties of one's state. The question of vocation would arise in some cases and a decision would be made either to act at once or to wait for a suitable moment. This

is the starting of the soul in its more excellent way. Then come progress in virtue, more perfect fulfilment of duties, strengthening of union with God. In prayer also there is advance, transition, elevation. Prayer, according to St. Francis after all the Fathers, is "a conversation with God." A new language has to be learnt, and not only must the tongue be educated to speak but, what is more difficult, the spiritual ear must be trained better and better to recognize and understand God's voice. In this long and persistent career, this voyage of life, this "warfare," there are moments of weakness, doubt and special temptation, change of surroundings, special inspirations. The director must be at hand to determine the course, to admonish, to stimulate, to cheer.

It is evident that such an office requires special qualities on the part of him who holds it. Our Saint sums them up in three: knowledge, prudence, charity; and to these three we devote what remains of this short paper. Nor shall we dwell long on the first two. We recall only the saying of St. Teresa that she would prefer a truly learned director who possessed sufficient virtue to an exceptionally holy one who possessed only a sufficiency of learning. In our Saint, his learning equalled his virtue, which is the highest praise that can be given to it. We do not refer to his supernatural lights and miraculous knowledge of the state of souls further than to point out how such graces prove the blessing of God upon this ministry of direction in the Church. The "prudence" which he demands is of course supernatural and not worldly prudence. This is an important point, perhaps insufficiently recognized in our age when holy activity is so much in vogue and holy quietude so little esteemed. The difference between natural and supernatural prudence is not that the one accepts the inevitable and the other does not. No one was ever wiser than our Saint in seeing and counselling what was practical. The difference is that natural prudence takes its laws from natural ends, trusts to natural means, and rests satisfied when these are attained and employed; whereas supernatural prudence has no guide but the highest principles of the Gospel and never ceases to

combat so long as these are not realized. It is noteworthy how in the Sermons and Letters of our saintly teacher, the assertion of these latter principles, as expressed in the Beatitudes, becomes stronger and as it were more defiant in proportion as he approaches the term of his apostolic career.

But we are impatient to reach that "charity" of his, which is his distinguishing characteristic, as a director. Fr. Suffren tells us how charity lay at the root of his work here: "His assiduity in the confessional sprang from his eagerness to destroy sin as contrary to God." "He was influenced," says St. Vincent de Paul, "by two considerations: grief for the loss of souls, burning desire of their salvation so as to be able to present them to the true Shepherd." Nor was he content with the simple destruction of sin; the tranquilizing of the heart was enough motive with him for any sacrifice. "What filled me with stupor," says the founder of the Sisters of Charity, "was principally this, that such a man, so exalted, so necessary for the gravest things, let himself be occupied by persons of the lowest condition for just as long as they desired, sparing no pains in order to give them full satisfaction, so greatly did he prize tranquility and peace of heart." No doubt he himself explained the mystery so to St. Vincent as he did to Fr. Suffren: "I asked him," says the great Jesuit, "how he, engaged in such grave affairs, allowed such or such a one to take so much of his time. He answered that he valued so highly the peace of the soul and heart that he spared nothing and interrupted everything in order to procure it for anyone." And in fact he was accustomed to subordinate everything else to this part of the sacred ministry. He would take off his vestments when on the way to Mass, leave the table and his company, even rise from bed to hear a confession. One witness tells us how a beggar man approached the Bishop when surrounded by a distinguished circle and said simply: "My lord, I want to confess." The humble Saint accompanied him at once to the Sacred Tribunal. He did the same on another occasion when a poor old woman, a street-hawker, beckoned to him with her finger as he was walking on the

balcony of the Maison-Favre. This condescension to the poor greatly tried his domestics and scandalized the worldly-wise. The Saint would disarm his impatient household by reminding them that the soul of a poor man cost Christ as much as the soul of an emperor. He would explain on other occasions that he considered their small affairs to be as important to the lowly as great affairs to the great. "Their *coquilles*," he would say with his gentle, penetrating irony, "are to them what our diamonds are to us."

It must not be supposed, however, that the length to which these conferences sometimes ran was the fault of the holy Bishop. He listened indeed with ineffable patience, but he spoke little. St. Jane and many others assure us that while his words were "grave, pregnant, decisive," they were very few in number. A simple glance was sometimes enough. M. Crichaut, one of his friends of Paris, says that once after absolution the Saint simply embraced him in silence, but the whole heart of the confessor seemed in that act to pass into the heart of the penitent. He would acknowledge and magnify his own failings to encourage those who found difficulty in their accusation, or say: "Have no fear; our souls are just alike. I am capable of all that you have done." He would give confidence to priest-penitents by confessing to them immediately after he had given them absolution. In all this facility, however, there was no absence of supernatural discretion nor of sober sense. If he thus gave up his life to pillage, to use Fr. Caussin's expression, it was not always as a director that he did so. When he saw that souls were not in earnest, he received them but he reserved his advice, "not preaching," says St. Jane Frances when recording this part of his method, "when there was no audience." His way with scrupulous souls agrees with this: "Let their reasons be heard one good time," he says, "then they must simply be made to obey."

It will easily be gathered from the preceding that everyone had liberty of access to the Saint. It was a saying of his that "a bishop ought to be like a public trough." His door was always open and his servants had the strictest orders

(orders which they must sometimes have disobeyed) to admit everyone to his presence without delay. Men went in and out as they liked. The rule for women was that the attendant accompanied them to the Bishop's room and if there was no chaplain or gentleman of importance present remained close to the open door. If there was question of confession, which was generally the case, he accompanied his master and remained in the chapel till the end of the confession unless replaced. This manner of behavior may seem to some inconsistent with the saint's style of writing to his female penitents, to many of whom he uses without scruple expressions of the most paternal tenderness. It will be seen, however, on reflection, that this belongs to quite another region. Words as the necessary signs for expressing the soul rank with the intellectual and spiritual order and passing in confidence between souls who are with God's grace sure of themselves and sure of one another, cannot give legitimate scandal. Actions begin to trench on the world of sense and are moreover exposed to malevolent interpretation. An expression attributed by Camus to the Bishop of Geneva, to the effect that women must be written to with the pen-knife and not with the pen can only have regarded, if ever used, those of whose discretion he was not assured. As a general statement it is false and absurd. A final remark on our Saint's charity is that he made little or no distinction between spiritual and temporal aid. For all who came to him he would do all the good that lay in his power. He did not stop to consider the nature of the favor. This is not to say that he made temporal help a part of his direction; only that he was very far from depriving his penitents of what he granted to all others. Each penitent was his friend, so he spent days and nights in settling their differences about worldly goods; he interested himself, in spite of the contrary practice of his great St. Augustine, in their marriages; he was always ready with alms, with legal advice, with recommendations; in a word he fulfilled to them all the offices of complete and disinterested friendship. To the poor he almost invariably gave an alms after their confession.

Certain difficulties or objections will no doubt by this time have presented themselves to the reader's mind. A first may be as to harmonizing the Saint's statement of the necessity of a director with his other statement that "the director must be chosen out of ten thousand." The chief answers to this difficulty are given by the holy Doctor, who puts to himself this question and gives the answer: "Who shall find this friend? The wise man answers: *Those who fear God*, that is, those who are humble and earnestly desire their spiritual advancement. Since then, O Philothea, it is so important to have such a guide, pray God earnestly to give you one, and have no fear, for He will do so even if He have to send an angel from heaven." To a certain penitent he says: "In necessity God will supply, but only then." We are not therefore driven, in order to explain this apparent contradiction, to the unworthy expedient of Camus, who said that his saintly friend meant his disciples to take not living but dead directors, that is, spiritual books. On the other hand, the innumerable treatises of direction which we now possess and which did not exist when St. Francis wrote his *Devout Life* and above all that work itself, render the director less absolutely necessary, or rather discharge him of a great deal of labor and responsibility. Nothing will relieve him of the study of the needs of the souls which apply to him; but it is not hard to find ready to his hand the means of supplying those needs. We may add again that though a director is necessary, he is not always necessary. To give the proper beginning and direction to our spiritual life, to decide the vocation, to guide at times of crisis, we ought to have a truly spiritual man who understands our case, but the rest can be found elsewhere, and it suffices that subordinate direction does not run counter to the principal.

Another question which naturally arises is this: how far should the method we have touched upon be imitated by ourselves, in our particular circumstances, with our miserable deficiencies? We should reply without hesitation that in some points St. Francis de Sales, like other saints, is only to be admired and not to be literally imitated by those who have

not special inspiration or who do not possess the measure of his sanctity. It is evident that those who are not free, religious for instance living in their convent, cannot give themselves to be devoured as did this representative of the divine benevolence and forbearance. Bishops who have not his special grace would act unwisely to let themselves be at the beck and call of the first beggar who could get near them. A general practice of giving alms after confession would breed the rankest hypocrisy unless preceded by contact with sanctity. Parish priests, who are the most nearly touched in this matter of direction, may reasonably, and more than reasonably, make their rules and limitations, reserve their hours for other duties to their neighbor or themselves. But surely we are called to imitate the spirit of these things, to remember our sacred duty, to reproach ourselves unless we are seriously trying, in our measure, to destroy sin, to give peace of heart, to hinder tepidity and the tendency towards routine, to raise lives to a higher level.

And in raising others we shall infallibly raise ourselves. We saw how the author of *The Devout Life* and the *Love of God* attributed the spiritual learning found in those works to the experience which he gained in directing souls. He gives us in the following beautiful words a glimpse of the profit in virtue which is to be made in the same holy exercise: "There is nothing perhaps which is more capable of advancing me towards holy humility than to see (with wonder) that so many men and women, servants of God, have so great confidence in so imperfect a spirit as mine is; and I take great courage on this to become such as I am thought to be, and I hope that God giving me the holy friendship of His children will give me His own most holy friendship, according to His mercy, after He has made me do penance suitable to my evilness." In fine, if we cannot do more we can scarcely do less than study and recommend these admirable teachings, so as to become channels if not sources of enlightenment and strength to the people of God.

DOM B. MACKEY, O.S.B.

Annecy, France, May, 1898.

CATHOLIC LITERARY CRITICISM.

IT IS only in very recent times that criticism has come to be regarded as a science; or to speak more correctly, as an accomplishment, the only credentials of which are the assumption of its possession. A science supposes apprenticeship, and qualifications tested by examination, or the tacit approval of experts. But no one, surely, expects that the vast majority of critics should be subjected to such trials, or should be expected to submit the only diploma of merit in a work of their own creation. Yet no man has a right to pull down who cannot build up again. For it is plain that a child may pluck to pieces a flower, which only the All-Powerful could frame and decorate. I am speaking of analytical and destructive criticism, for the science of synthetic and constructive criticism has yet to be discovered. And yet it is the great desideratum in modern times, especially for us, Catholics. Mr. Arnold, who approaches nearer to the ideal of this master-critic than any writer of our century (if we may, perhaps, except Mr. Taine), has told us that the great work to which moderns are called is a better, higher, more world-wide criticism than any we have yet known. This he defines to be "the disinterested endeavor to learn and propagate the best that is known and thought in the world." "Real criticism," he says, "is essentially the exercise of curiosity as to ideas and all subjects, for their own sakes, apart from any practical interest they may serve; it obeys an instinct prompting it to try to know the best that is known and thought in the world, irrespectively of practice, politics, and everything of the kind, and to value knowledge and thought as they approach this best, without the intrusion of any other considerations whatever." I would, of course, entirely disagree with Mr. Arnold in what he considers the best thought of the world; for he would regard it from a purely literary and artistic standpoint; and we cannot regard thought, or written or spoken word, without relation to the highest and supremest issues that are at stake in the

world. But I gladly welcome the definition that criticism is the pursuit and study of high thought and adequate execution; and as such takes its rank amongst the very greatest of the sciences that cast their light athwart the footsteps of humanity. For men need guidance to-day as of old. Not many readers can trust their own judgments. And it is easy to conceive readers, young and old, hopelessly bewildered and dazed in the awful flood of printed matter that is yearly flung from the printing-presses of the world; and still more hopelessly bewildered at the conflicting opinions that are thrust upon them from all directions as to what is vicious and ephemeral, or what is useful and permanent, in modern literature. A critic, therefore, serves a most useful purpose in wisely discriminating between the valuable and useful elements of literature; and I should consider a good Catholic critic endowed almost with an apostolic vocation of being able to "try all things" with impunity, and "hold fast by what is good."

Of the intelligence and wisdom, the delicacy of perception, and the wide liberalism of thought, that should be the dowry of such a writer, it would be difficult to speak with exaggeration. Very great issues are at stake. The best thinkers in America and the British Isles are unanimous in the belief that quite a new departure in our Catholic literature is demanded by our own necessities, and still more by the duties we owe our Christian brethren who are outside the pale of the Church. It is the written word that tells best to a generation that is omnivorous in its reading. But the written word must be conveyed through an attractive channel; and that channel is what is designated by the broad title—literature. It is through literature we have to work and convey to the minds of our own people, a thirst for knowledge and principle and the encouragement that comes from high ideas and noble language, the exalted truths and the thrilling ideas that are part of our heritage. And it is through literature we have to open the vast treasures of the Church, and show them to those who believe we are stricken with the curse of intellectual poverty. Let me take one

department. Have we popularized our philosophy? Attempts have been made to translate it from the folios of the Fathers to the dainty octavos and duodecimos of modern libraries. Some manuals of philosophy and its history have been published. Yet they lack attractiveness. And here under my hand is a treatise on Modern Pantheism, to which, owing to its wonderful brilliancy of style, any reader might turn with pleasure, when wearied with the inanities of a modern novel. Is our fiction attractive and readable? Mr. Edmond Gosse, in the *North American Review*, declares that the great characteristic of the last decade of years has been the abnormal and disproportionate, but unquestioned development of the novel. He even startles us with the assertion that our best writers are drawn irresistibly in that direction; and he even puts forward the rather daring speculation, that if men like Buckle, Newman or Ruskin had been in their prime during the last few years, they would have chosen fiction as the means of putting forward and emphasizing their pet theories. How do we Catholics stand in that particular? And in poetry, what position do we hold? And is our Ecclesiastical History, with all its beautiful episodes, familiar to the reading public? These are questions that may cause us some heart-burnings and anxious searching of consciences; and these are the questions which a Catholic critic has the power of solving to our satisfaction. For it is not either writers or material that we lack. It is the sympathetic appreciation of what is good in our literature; and the kindly rejection of what is weak. As to our material, we have for philosophy, the vast treasure-houses of the Fathers; for poetry, subjects that reach from the lowliest work of Nature, seen as the handiwork of God, up to the vast and awful sublimities of the last Cantos of the Paradiso; for essays, we have all the complexities of modern civilization as they are studied under the piercing light, and unravelled by the unerring hand of the Church's teaching and discipline; for fiction, we have Catholic life in our cities, our towns, our prairies, on Irish hills, in English castles, on American lakes and mountains, in the sweet amenities and regularities

of Catholic married life, in the sublime simplicity of our convents; in our soldiers and sailors, our schoolboys, our priests, our professional men, our merchants, our great ladies, our simple, faithful servants. We have English and German Catholicity, Polish and Irish to deal with; and we have above all certain well-defined elements and principles that will keep our novels from running into the dreadful issues that mark all modern English novels. And the writers, where are they? There are many in the field; many more, who would come forward if they expected, or had any reason to expect, a fair, if not a kindly recognition of their work. Now, it is just here that a good Catholic critic is invaluable to our literature. He can understand what is written. This should be his first accomplishment. And it is a rare one. To enter into an author's feelings and designs, to know what he aims at, to separate essentials from accidentals; and, if the work is solidly good, to recognize it as such—these are qualifications that suppose a great deal of discernment and experience. In judging, for instance, of poetry, what delicacy of feeling, what a sense of musical notation, may be required! It is notorious that great thinkers on great subjects, may be absolutely without a sense of harmony. It is even true that writers whose prose style is absolutely perfect in tone and form, may lack not only the musical sense, but even the conception of the essentials of poetry. I have before my mind, as I write, the name of a writer, whose works from a historical and philosophical standpoint are monumental; and who has also written some chopped lines of prose, which not all the charity of his friends can keep him from believing are Miltonic in form and conception. The highest poetry, as a fact, does not come into the domain of criticism at all. It soars above, and eludes the grasp of the critic. It is sometimes not unintelligible, but inexplicable to the poet himself. He can neither analyze, nor explain it. Does not Plato say so: "All good poets, epic as well as lyric, compose their beautiful poems, not as works of art, but because they are inspired and possessed. For the poet is a light, and winged, and holy thing,

and there is no invention in him until he has been inspired." How then can a man who knows nothing of the divine afflatus, deal with this aerial being? Well, he clips and burns the wings of this "light, winged, and holy thing," and makes him a creeping caterpillar.

Again, some lonely student, who has been, in his seclusion, feeding on the marrow of giants, puts forth, it may be resolutely, it may be timidly, some essence of what has become to him vital and necessary truth. It is put in strange language, and is without the musty odor of mediævalism or the schools. A timid critic will sniff ominously at it, and pass it by. A too daring critic will strive to annihilate it, and fail. The matured and discriminating mind of one who is well grounded in sacred sciences and their modern applications will alone understand it and let the world know of it. Yet, if this grave critic does not come by, how surely that work, which might be fraught with all kinds of important consequences to the Church and the world, will be flung aside to rot on booksellers' shelves or adorn the topmost level of a lending-library.

Granted, then, sufficient knowledge and liberality of mind in our critic, I should say that his first principle in selecting for commendation a Catholic book should be the reversal or rather the direct contradictory of the old scholastic maxim, *Bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quocunque defectu.* A perfectly healthy axiom in moral science. A vicious and pernicious maxim in criticism. Writers, like their books, are not perfect. Young writers, particularly, will slip into solecisms very easily, because in aiming at a main object they are prone to forget side issues. Again, writers who are vividly impressed with certain ideas, are naturally intense in their expressions. Is it not George Eliot who has said somewhere, "Art, of necessity, intensifies"? It is its province—its vocation. What would Turner be without his intense idealism? What would Watts be, without his intense, sometimes painful realism? The bare truth never convinces. A too strict adherence to the features of man or nature generally ends in a bathos. If, therefore, a writer who feels

intensely the necessity of driving home his ideas to the public mind, sins inadvertently by faults of art or even by venial extravagances of principles, it is neither prudent nor kind to condemn him absolutely and to close the book to a large class of readers.

And this thought brings me naturally to what is the immediate subject of this paper—the ethical aspect of criticism. I am addressing Catholics, who, whatever their position may be, can never put off the sense of moral responsibility. I am not addressing that school of insolence and incompetence which is best represented by such sheets as the *Saturday Review*. Let us keep two facts in view, which will enable us to determine principles. The first is that which Jean Paul Richter states, and which is unhappily too true, namely, that the anonymous character of a reviewer gives to the judgment of an individual the weight of a college. The second is, that nowadays no Catholic writer can publish a volume except at his own expense. As to the first, however much we may regret it, it is but too true. The writer, who sits at his desk, and hastily cuts the leaves of a new volume, wields judicial power of life and death over that volume, according to the journal he represents. And many a book has passed rapidly over the counter until some foolish novice at the pen thinks he has discovered a mistake, and gloats over it and magnifies it until the public becomes suspicious, and the sale is suddenly stopped. What is the result? The publication of the book has cost the author from seventy to one hundred pounds. It becomes a dead loss. If then, the *critique* which has killed the book has been an unscrupulous and an unjust one, the writer is unquestionably bound to restitution.

A book is *pretio aestimabilis*, the same as a horse, or a piece of merchandise. If a flippant, unthinking critic, whose opinion, however, is regarded by the public, pronounces unjustly that an animal is unsound and unsaleable, or a piece of dry goods damaged, he is bound to restitution if such an opinion is wrong, and he has uttered it maliciously or carelessly. It is the property of the author or the pub-

lisher; and they have a right that their property shall not be injured by statements that are untrue or unsound.

Does the neglect or contempt of this theological principle account for the very pitiful condition of our Catholic literature? Does it account for the fact that our best writers have laid down their pens; and that a great many gifted souls whose vocation is literature, dread the loss of money on the one hand, or the loss of reputation on the other? Would it account in some measure for that amusing, but pathetic and painful admission of the greatest of our Catholic living poets:[1] "I can call no man in my position badly off, for I can double my income any day—by laying down my pen?" That melancholy fact is staring us in the face, that Aubrey de Vere, the friend of Wordsworth and Tennyson, and quite their equal, has had no audience, because of the Catholicity that deeply permeates every line he wrote. I would rather have written "May Carols," than "In Memoriam." Yet, who reads the former; and who has not read the latter?

I am distinctly of opinion, therefore, that we have no Catholic reading public, because the Higher Criticism, or what I have ventured to call constructive criticism, is unknown. We have a good deal of negative criticism—of which there are two great schools—the hyperæmic and the anæmic. Of the two, the latter is the most formidable; but let me take them in detail.

The hyperæmic critic is always young, inexperienced, sanguine, self-reliant. He does not, to use a phrase of Cardinal Newman's, understand the solemn weight and meaning of words. He is as irresponsible with his pen as a boy with a new revolver. He feels it his duty to kill or maim something. To praise a book means weakness or want of knowledge. To find fault presupposes wisdom and superiority. And, therefore, is he always "on the pounce" to discover faults and mistakes, on which he can build his final judgment, which is always that of the *Quarterly Review* on Keats: "This will never do." His mode of reviewing is peculiar. He commences with a quotation from

1 Aubrey De Vere.

Aristotle or Plato, generally the latter, as being much more in vogue than his great logical rival. The application of this great principle, thus quoted, he leaves to the reader; and descends to particulars. Waiving altogether the object of the book, its construction and technique, he addresses himself to a microscopic inspection of phrases and even words. A printer's error is a crime; a mistake in date, or a slip in some secondary phrase is magnified into a literary misdemeanor. "This author mistakes an acid for an alkali, surely this is unpardonable." "Is the author quite correct in the date of the second crusade? We think not. Surely the public have a right to expect something better than this slip-shod writing." "The author here falls into a blunder that would be unpardonable in a school-boy. He makes Sirius blaze away in the south at midnight in the month of June." These appear rather trifling mistakes, but they leave the book limp and tattered in the end, for a good many readers follow the principle we have already condemned, *malum ex quocunque defectu;* and judge of the value of the book by some quite extrinsic standard, just as in some parts of England, the rustics judge of the qualifications of a new parson by his style of horsemanship. Then comes the final verdict: "On the whole we think the book may be recommended to our readers; but we hope the author will do better in his next volume." Who would invest a dollar in a book that comes before the world with such an introduction?

The anæmic school is worse, for it generally takes the high moral tone. Its eternal warning to authors is *pueris, virginibusque;* its motto, *maxima reverentia pueris debetur.* Very true. But what of grown men and women? Are they to be always fed on whey? They demand a stronger diet. Can we give it? If not, they have the poisonous narcotics of English and French literature, that will drown all their Christian sensibilities and steep them in that spiritual torpor, which is like unto death.

There is a great temptation here to enter into a cognate question, which, however, does not come strictly within the scope of this paper, namely, the question of the Catholic

novel. It may be passed by the more easily, because it has been so frequently discussed in our journals these latter years. But to show how Catholic authors may be driven from the field by criticisms of these retrogressive schools, let me quote two instances. In these islands, within the last few years, we have had two promising writers—the one in poetry, the other in prose. It is no exaggeration to say that when the first volume of poems by Francis Thompson appeared a few years ago, they created quite a sensation in London literary circles. The life of the author, full of all kinds of strange vicissitudes, may have had something to say to his sudden popularity in a community that is always on the search for new sensations. But the novelty of these poems, constructed on new principles, and inspired with the loftiest thought, attracted the attention of the leading literati of London; and forced reluctant praise from circles where the religious tenets of the author, and the subjects of his poems, were by no means recommendations. The author was ranked amongst the *Dii Majores* of song, by the great Scottish review on the one hand, and by such authors and critics as Richard le Gallienne, etc., on the other. But the author has retired. For the present he will write no more poetry. Why? I should hardly like to intrude upon the privacy of another's thoughts; but Francis Thompson, who, with all his incongruities, ranks in English poetry with Shelley, and *only* beneath Shakespeare, has hardly had any recognition in Catholic circles. If Francis Thompson had been an Anglican or a Unitarian, his praises would have been sung unto the ends of the earth. He would have been the creator of a new school of poetry. Disciples would have knelt at his feet. Had he been a graduate of Oxford or Cambridge, his bust would have been placed in their halls. But being only a Catholic and an Ushaw student, he is allowed to retire, and bury in silence one of the noblest imaginations that has ever been given to Nature's select ones—her poets. Only two Catholics—literary Catholics—have noticed this surprising genius—Coventry Patmore and Wilfred Meynell. The vast bulk of our co-religionists have not even heard his

name, although it is already bruited amongst the immortals; and *the* great Catholic poet, for whose advent we have been straining our vision, has passed beneath our eyes, sung his immortal songs, and vanished. Now, to what class of criticism has this great poet been subjected? To the verbal and puerile criticism I have detailed above. All his crudities and irregularities were carefully noted and exaggerated; and the great kernels of his marvellous conceptions were feebly praised. His latinisms and coined phrases were counted as solecisms that could not be tolerated; as if a poet had not a perfect right to do what he liked with mere language. It is the poets that have given us the English language as it is; and to refuse to a Victorian poet, what was so freely conceded to an Elizabethan, is to declare that the tongue of Shakespeare and Milton had reached a point beyond which it must not be developed. There are undoubtedly in this great master, I do not say of verse, but of thought, certain incongruities that we cannot explain, such as applying to our Divine Lord the epithet "The Hound of Heaven"; but perhaps the poet had some inner meaning which we may not discern, and if we object to the title, at least we accept the poem as the most wonderful piece of literary mechanism we possess. If this be so why have we not said so to the world, instead of shaking our heads at points of versiculation or metre, that are really of no consequence? No; our great poet has come and gone. He is now writing little prose sketches for *Franciscan Annals* at Pantasaph. He will write no more poetry for the present.

The other example of our utter incompetency to appreciate our Catholic authors and their works may be found in our dealings with the author of *The New Antigone*. When that book appeared, some said: "At last we have entered the arena with the world's own weapons. It will go hard with us or we shall succeed. The novel is the modern vehicle of thought. We shall use it to propagate truth, as the world uses it to propagate error." Were there faults in that book? Yes. But why did we dwell on and exaggerate them, forgetful of the main object at stake, and heedless of the splendid

valor of the writer, who took the enemy's weapons and turned them against himself? Had this brilliant Catholic writer been encouraged he would probably, by this time, have poured forth a library of standard Catholic novels from his pen. But he has retired from the prosecution of a task thankless and dangerous; and he has been driven into this retirement by the critics of the anæmic school. "When he appears again," says a witty American priest, "it will be as the author of a goody-goody story, which tells how little Jemmy, the shoeblack, labored and toiled for the support of an aged mother, then sickened and died; and how little Mamie was altogether too good for this world, and so entered a convent and lived for ever and for ever."

What, then, do we contend for? Simply the criticism that creates, instead of destroying. Never in the history of the Church's life was there a period more favorable for the creation of a great Catholic literature. The world is listening, if we could speak. We are in the midst of a revolt against all modern literature. In poetry there is an outcry against the artificialities that are poured from the press like Christmas cards and Christmas numbers, and are quite as inane and inartistic. There is a desire even to get back to the simplicities of Pope and Goldsmith. In philosophy we have but a rehash of ancient errors and a feeble attempt to reconstruct them into modern systems. In religious literature we have dull sermons, platitudes about Christianity without Christ, denial of dogma, and all the dreary latitudinarianism that is the chief characteristic of modern Protestantism. There is no criticism nor critical school. In essay writing, *obiter dicta*, etc., we have but the ephemeral papers of magazines. No one now dreams of reproducing his articles in the reviews. And the novel has gone down into the lowest depths of suggestiveness. When Dean Farrar and Mr. Stead are at loggerheads as to whether a certain situation in *The Christian* means adultery or not, we can understand how low the English novel has fallen. And the world is disgusted. It craves for some higher intellectual food. It is tired of frothy salaciousness. Here, then, is the grand

opportunity for Catholic authors. We have solid truth to teach the world, if only we can put it into attractive form. But we must keep ourselves always distinct and separate in our literature. Whatever be said of the wisdom of our mixing freely amongst our separated brethren and familiarizing them with our practices and teachings, our literature must be always exclusive and characteristic. It must not be imitative of modern styles, still less of modern ideas. We have abundant material for building up a great masculine literature, human and sympathetic, divine and transcendental. It must touch human infirmity without gross realism ; it must deal with passions without the luridness of detail that makes passions absorbing and infectious. And, above all, it must shed around human life and all its many environments that beautiful idealism, which is our exclusive possession. All the tendencies of the world to-day point to a levelling down of age, sex, position, dignity ; *we* know that there must be diversity and distinctiveness to maintain the Christian ideal. And we also know that it is only in this conservatism, that draws its ancient lines and barriers around rank and sex, that either Christian dignity or Christian morality are to be maintained. But it is only the idealism founded on Catholic dogma that can effect this. If, then, the world is so fanatical in its opposition to this Christian ideal, and if to-day the leaders of its literature are iconoclasts of every sacred image and tradition that have hitherto been the hope of our race, surely it is incumbent upon us to maintain in all their integrity those ideas that are the soul of our religious systems. And can there be a more ignoble treason than to bow to every foolish whim, that under the guise of literature, is put forth to please or pander to the irregularities of a world that is drifting steadily backward into yet another phase of Neo-Paganism?

It follows, then, that the world has again to be taught Christianity, and has to be taught it in its own idioms and dialects, that is, not in scholastic phrases or syllogisms, not in the language of mediæval schools, but in its own tongue —that is, through the medium of literature. It has been said

that if St. Paul were living to-day he would be a journalist, that is, he would use the speediest and easiest medium of conveying to the world the ideas, that were to him as the breath of life. Here, then, is the vocation of the young and ardent Catholic who wishes to do something for Christ before the shadows fall and the night comes on. And there cannot be a loftier vocation than to preach and teach to the wide world, that is drifting so rapidly from the side of Christ, something of that divine sweetness and light that have been, and must ever be, the hope and solace of humanity. But such neophytes need encouragement, and as such they become the wards of the Catholic Press. If inefficient or weak, it is not beyond the courtesies of the language or the delicacy of Christian refinement to ask them, without giving pain, to retire from an arena where their presence would but embarrass better qualified champions. But if there be a hope or promise of success it is surely the duty of the press to raise those hopes and confirm such promise, and this on independent grounds, heedless of what a godless journalism, to which the name of Catholicism is *maranatha*, may put forth. Nay, the very highest testimony to the excellence of a Catholic work should be the revilings of a press that is not only material in all its concepts, but which seems to be always hesitating between the mock humility of agnosticism and the unblushing indecorum of blasphemy.

It is a question, whether up to this time we have not been too deferential to the criticism of a hostile press, as well as too liberal in our estimates not only of anti-Catholic, but even anti-theistic literature. There is a kind of Catholic liberalism that sees too much good in the poisonous and noxious products of the Protestant and infidel press, and there is a tendency to bow down before the fetishes which a corrupt generation finds to worship in its sciences, in its arts and in its letters. Our writers forget that in the words of Tertullian, "every arrow that is shot against us has been dragged from the quiver of truth." If we have strength to use the world's weapons against itself it is what the world has already done to ourselves. And we have some idea that

the equipments of our armories are not only adequate, but superabundant for the warfare in which we are engaged. Let us, therefore, have a Catholic literature, and let us acknowledge it. Let us reserve our scorn for our antagonists and keep our encouragement for ourselves. It is unwise in the forefront of the battle to depreciate our forces. Not that we need admit the puerile and weakly elements that may undermine our strength. But our solicitude should be to strengthen the ranks of our literary workers, to be eager for their success, so that when the world bows down before Catholic genius, it may be tempted to consider Catholic truth, and to forget the traditional scorn, which, unfortunately, we ourselves too frequently adopt; and whose watchword is: "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?"

P. A. SHEEHAN.

Doneraile, Ireland.

CLERICAL STUDIES.

XXXVI.

THE APOLOGETIC STUDY OF THE BIBLE. (IV.)

THE last, but not the least important aspect under which the Bible has to be studied is that of its defense. To rob it of its sacredness and reduce it to the level of an ordinary product of the human mind has been at all times the aim of unbelief, but never more so than in the present age. Never, consequently, has it been more necessary that the natural defenders of divine truth should be armed for the contest; that they should have some knowledge, and if possible a thorough knowledge, of the chief points of attack, of the methods of the assailants, and of the tactics by which they may be most effectively repulsed. Indeed, it may be

said that the apologetic work of the priest to-day is mainly the defence of the Bible. In the sixteenth century infidelity came with literature; in the eighteenth with philosophy; in the nineteenth it has come chiefly with Biblical studies. This, therefore, is the field in which the Christian apologist has to concentrate his forces. In others, occasional battles will have to be fought—in philosophy, in history, in the physical and moral sciences—but the contest in this generation will continue to rage oftenest, longest and hottest around the Books of the Old and the New Testament.

I.

Attacks on the Bible are nothing new in religious history; they are almost as old as Christianity itself. Celsus, the philosopher, assailed the Sacred Books in the second century; the mystic, Porphyry, in the third; Julian the Apostate, in the fourth, and these were only the leaders. Their objections, such as we find them reproduced and refuted by Origen, Eusebius, St. Cyril of Alexandria, etc., are much of the same kind. They fix upon what seems contradictory or incredible in the Old and the New Testament, and conclude that the religion which is based upon it is worthless. The strange history of creation, the formation of Adam and Eve, as described in Genesis, the temptation, the deluge, the Tower of Babel, the story of Jonas, of Daniel, the seeming discrepancies of the Gospels, in fact almost all the popular objections of to-day are already to be found in those early writers. The Christians of the period do not seem to have been much concerned about them. It was nearly a hundred years after Celsus had written his "True Discourse" Λογος αληθης—that Origen answered it. Julian's "Discourse against the Christians" elicited several contemporary replies; but objections and responses soon lost all interest and disappeared so completely, that nothing of the whole controversy with Julian now remains, outside the refutation to be found among the voluminous writings of S. Cyril of Alexandria.

With the death of the apostate Emperor all further opposition to the Sacred Books practically disappeared, and for

better than a thousand years the Bible became the accepted law of religious thought and life throughout the civilized world. Its difficulties indeed had not disappeared, nor were all minds entirely blind to them. St. Augustine felt he was rendering a practical service when "to answer the objections of unbelievers, and the questionings of believers whose faith is disturbed," he wrote his remarkable book on the Harmony of the Gospels: *De Consensu Evangelistarum*,—in which he undertook to prove that no contradiction could be found in their fourfold narrative. Neither was the short book of St. Gregory the Great, *Concordia quorumdam terminorum Stae. Scripturae* without its use, nor the larger work of St. Julian of Toledo written a hundred years later, *Antikeimenon libri duo*, to explain a considerable number of verbal discrepancies in the Bible. But even these ceased to be needed. The deep reverent spirit which pervaded the following ages forbade men to scrutinize closely the outward aspects of the revealed Word. To demand an explanation of the perplexing problems which they suggested would have looked like a challenge to the Almighty to explain His ways to His creatures and to refuse submission unless human presumption had first been satisfied.

And so Christians instinctively turned away from such questions as irreverent, unprofitable and calculated only to weaken their faith and expose them to the sin of unbelief. They looked up to the Bible and listened to it with religious awe; but they dared not look into it and examine it curiously as they might any other book. They gladly learned what the Fathers had said of it, but outside some new mystical interpretations, they did not venture to indulge in any speculations of their own. Its human elements and aspects, so much dwelt upon in our time, were not as much as noticed by them, still less the imperfections which the Holy Spirit had allowed to cling to what was mainly His work. On what had come directly from God, mortal man, they thought, should not sit in judgment.

And yet such a judgment was bound to come at one time or another. To humble and unquestioning faith, rational

inquiry is sure to succeed in every sphere as soon as the mind, quickened to active thought, perceives problems, old or new, and feels able to handle them. This condition of things came, as regards the Bible, with the Renaissance, and grew with the steady increase of learning and exceptional mental activity which characterized the following ages. Biblical studies had their full share in the general movement. Questions without number came up and were examined in the full light of the new learning, yet still without any departure from the traditional reverence of the past.

It was only in the eighteenth century, with the advent of Deism that, after the lapse of so many centuries of universal reverence, the Bible was once again assailed and had to be defended. In England, in France, in Germany a host of writers denied its divine character, attacked its doctrines and questioned its facts. But this assault, though most harmful, was only a preparation for an aggression far more systematic, abiding and destructive, that of the rationalistic school which, in various forms and degrees, has steadily widened its operations and strengthened its positions during the whole course of the present century.

It is against this school that the defender of Holy Writ has chiefly to contend in our time, and the task is by no means an easy one. To meet the coarse wit of Toland or the polished sarcasm of Voltaire, or the ingenious sophisms of Hume and Rousseau, it was not necessary to be possessed of exceptional learning. Their knowledge of the Bible was superficial, and only a little better knowledge of it, with common sense, sufficed to answer them logically, if not to destroy their power of seduction.

With our rationalists the case is entirely different. They are Bible scholars, specialists, experts, with a perfect knowledge of the Sacred Text, of the language in which it was originally written, of the physical and historical surroundings amid which the events it records are supposed to have happened, of the latest discoveries in the various sciences which can help to understand and appreciate its statements. Their authority, based on these qualifications, is paramount

with most of those who give them a hearing, and the number of minds they reach through their lectures and writings, reflected and reëchoed in the literature of the day, is simply countless. How to counteract their influence is the problem to be solved by the apologist. To attempt it, his first care must be to become acquainted with the principal aspects and phases of the contest up to the present day. We cannot undertake to follow them up here in detail, but there is room for giving them in general outline.

II.

Two hundred years ago, as we have said, the books of the Old and the New Testament were held in universal veneration. No doubt was entertained of their authenticity. Moses was the unquestioned author of the Pentateuch, Solomon of the Proverbs; Isaias, Daniel, and the other prophets, of all that bore their names; the evangelists and apostles of the writings of the New Testament respectively assigned to them. But their principal author was the Holy Ghost, for they were all inspired, and inspired in all their parts. This is what made them invaluable to Christians, their divine origin warranting their perfect inerrancy. "If once we admit error in the Scriptures," said St. Jerome, "what further authority can they possess?" "The whole structure of the faith totters," added St. Augustine, "once the authority of Scripture is shaken"—*Titubat fides si divinarum Scripturarum vacillat auctoritas.* His fundamental principle was then that no error could possibly be found in any statement emanating from so sacred a source. This once admitted, it only remained to discern the true meaning of the inspired word, and for that St. Augustine again supplied the rule: "that the literal and obvious sense should not be departed from except only where reason makes it untenable or necessity requires." Under the action of these principles there had sprung up a most elaborate system of belief extending to everything upon which Scripture seemed to bear. Thus, it was held that the visible universe was made out of nothing

about six thousand years ago; that the earth was the immovable centre around which sun, moon, and stars revolve; that all the species of living beings were made as they are found; that the whole history of the creation of Adam and Eve, the temptation and the fall, had to be taken literally; that the waters of the deluge had covered the whole face of the earth and destroyed all living things outside what was contained in the ark; that Josue had stayed the sun in its course, etc. These and numberless other particulars of a similar kind, gathered from the Old and New Testament and believed unhesitatingly for ages, had become an integral part of the popular faith and of orthodox theology.

But the time came when every one of them was in turn to be scientifically tested, some with fatal effect. Astronomy, first of all, demonstrated that the older conception of the universe was at fault; that the sun, not the earth, is the centre around which the planets, including the earth itself, regularly revolve. Geology came and showed that the work of creation must have begun at an incalculable distance of ages from us, and that its present condition reveals a process of organization which, instead of a few days, must have gone on for millions of years. Evolution came and claimed for animals and for man himself an origin entirely different from that described in Genesis, while history, archæology, philology, appealed to in turn, assigned to him a far greater antiquity than was allowed by the chronology of the Bible. Similar difficulties were urged against the story of the deluge, of the Tower of Babel, of Josue, of Samson, etc. Besides the discrepancies which St. Augustine and others had endeavored to explain away, numberless others were pointed to which could not be easily disposed of and which, if admitted, would destroy, it was thought, the claim to inerrancy of the Sacred Books. The books themselves, submitted to a critical examination, seemed to reveal —especially the more important, such as the Pentateuch— an origin much more recent than was supposed, thereby losing the authority, historical or prophetical, which they naturally enjoyed in the earlier hypothesis.

These are some of the difficulties with which apologists have had to contend in modern times, not all together, but in succession, as the new sciences came into existence and were enlisted in the service of unbelief. Let us now see how it was attempted to meet them.

1. First, as might be expected, the traditional view, being considered obligatory, was defended in all its parts. An attempt was made to show that what was objected was scientifically groundless, or at least not to be compared with the authority upon which the older conception rested, or else could be accounted for without sacrificing the traditional beliefs. Endless mathematical calculations were made to prove that there was plenty of water in the ocean and in the air to deluge the world, plenty room in the ark to accommodate pairs of all living things. Finally, in regard to all such facts, it was observed that nothing is impossible to God, and that, having vouchsafed to tell us what He had done, nothing remained for us but to humbly accept His revealed word.

2. Yet the system had to yield in many points to the pressure of accumulated facts. One after another positions which had been deemed vital were given up. After all, St. Augustine had foreseen such a possibility and provided for it (*vel necessitas requirat*). The necessity had come and the concessions were made—slowly, grudgingly—but they were made. And as St. Augustine again had said: "Whatever they can demonstrate to be true of physical nature we must show to be capable of reconciliation with our Scriptures," the latter were read afresh and found susceptible of new and scientific meanings. This represents the second method or phase of Biblical apologetics. In the former the facts were denied or accommodated to the letter of the Bible. In the latter the Bible was interpreted in harmony with the facts. Nor did this imply any change of principle. It had always been understood—though too often forgotten—that God in the Bible accommodates Himself to the minds of men and follows the laws of their language; that other meanings besides the literal had, at all times, been admitted in certain

cases, and might be admitted in many more when the circumstances required it.

Once introduced and found to work satisfactorily, the process extended rapidly, smoothed down scores of difficulties and represented for a time a happy alliance of human knowledge and divine faith.

But only for a time. It was soon noticed that, to meet the requirements of science, constructions had to be put on several texts of the Bible which were strained, unnatural, and visibly foreign to the mind of the sacred writers. Besides, while covering many points of difficulty, the system left many more untouched, any one of which would suffice to destroy the claims of the Bible to absolute inerrancy. To meet the ever increasing array of such difficulties, a certain number of apologists were led to fall back on another line of defense.

3. The purpose of God, they said, when He teaches man through revelation is not to instruct him or to correct his errors as to the things of this world, it is to enlighten him morally and spiritually. In all else He leaves him to his natural resources. In the inspired books, therefore, in so far as they convey moral and religious truth, there can be no error. In all else the inspired writer is liable to mistakes, like any other man; nor is there any need for the apologist to explain them away or to defend them.

Such a conception of inspiration, as extending only to thet doctrinal portions of the Sacred Books, is very plausible a first sight. It simplifies wonderfully the task of the apologist, and allows him to take his stand upon a ground on which he is almost unassailable. It has been widely adopted among conservative Protestants, and even some Catholics have been led to give it their assent. But in so doing they completely abandon a position which was always held sacred in the past. None of the Fathers will listen to the notion of a mistake in any of the sacred writers. "I have so learned to honor and reverence Holy Writ," says St. Augustine, "as firmly to believe that no inspired writer could fall into error: *ut nullum eorum auctorem scribendo aliquid errasse, firmissime*

credam." It is not only in its doctrinal parts that the Bible is inspired, it is integrally and in every portion of it. The Bible does not merely contain the Word of God, it is the Word of God. And this is why Pope Leo XIII., in his recent encyclical on the study of Scripture, formally declares that "those who maintain that an error is possible in any genuine passage of the Sacred Writings, pervert the Catholic notion of inspiration, and make God the author of such error."

This declaration, though it may not be considered as *ex cathedra*, has sufficed to warn off our Catholic apologists from the dangerous ground which some of them had been momentarily led to occupy. But at the same time, by calling attention to the popular character of the language of the inspired writings, the Sovereign Pontiff helped them in another way to broaden and strengthen the position they had previously held. Nor have they been slow to avail themselves of it. More freely than ever before do we find them admitting in the inspired pages loose and inexact statements, side by side with what is strictly accurate; figurative language of all kinds, metaphors, hyperboles, rhetorical amplifications, facts veiled in poetic forms, seeming narratives which are only allegories or parables, all the modes of human speech and all the literary peculiarities of Eastern peoples.

It is easy to see what pliancy and power of accommodation is imparted thus to the Sacred Books, and what corresponding facility the apologist finds to extricate himself from otherwise insuperable difficulties. One of the points most fruitful in its applications is this: that inspiration does not change the established literary habits of a people or of a writer; that what is considered no departure from truth in an ordinary book, should not be viewed otherwise because the book is inspired. It follows that before declaring that what seems a literal statement in the Bible is untrue, it must first be ascertained whether it is meant as a statement at all, and next, if so, to what extent it is meant or expected to be accurate. Thus, for example, the number forty applied to a period of days or years did not mean for a Hebrew writer, or for his

readers, that exact measure of time which it represents to the modern mind. In fact one of the most ordinary sources of difficulties and of general misapprehension of the ancient Oriental books which constitute nearly the whole Bible, is found to be the habit of interpreting them by our own modern rules and standards. For the errors, ours not theirs, to which this gives rise, surely the sacred writers cannot be made responsible.

By another application of this same principle several of our apologists exonerate from the reproach of error the sacred writers who give divergent accounts of the same fact. They claim that in such cases only substantial accuracy was ever intended or expected, not exactness of detail. Or, again, they consider the sacred writers as borrowing their information from the best accessible sources and giving it as they found it, its value being really independent of the correctness of all its details. To put it in general terms, they hold that God in the Bible teaches only what is taught by the sacred writer, and that the latter teaches only what he means to teach. So that ultimately the whole question resolves itself into that of the mind of the human author, which has, in turn, to be gathered from the nature of what he writes, the literary methods of his time, etc. These are only some of the lines on which the defence of the Bible has been, and continues to be pursued up to the present day. One mode may be mentioned as having led to the happiest results. It consists in following our Bible critics over the various fields of research from which they claim to draw their strongest objections—history, antiquities, philology, etc.—and showing how questionable are many of their facts and how groundless their conclusions.

And now if we would sum up in a few words the result of this lengthened contest we may say that it has not resulted in a complete victory for either side. Each of the opposing forces has had to give up some of its positions. Hundreds of objections loudly trumpeted for a time have been effectively silenced. Destructive theories, after a short period of popularity, have gradually faded out of sight. Statements put

forth at first with unbounded confidence have quietly been dropped and are no longer heard of. Much had been made of the silence of antiquity around Jewish history. But that silence is broken. From the hidden monuments of Egypt, of Assyria and Chaldea, voices have come forth so significant that the main lines of our Sacred History are now admitted by all to be true.

On the other hand many of the older interpretations of the Bible, which were long looked upon as sacred, are given up by Catholics and Protestants alike, nor does the process of evolution seem to be at an end. Each decade is marked by notable concessions, made reluctantly or readily according to the tendencies of individuals and of schools. For, whilst all unite in defending the Sacred Books, there is much difference of opinion as to what has to be defended in connection with them. There is the conservative school, more disposed to cling to the past, and the broad, progressive school, as we might call it, more alive to the facts and exigencies of the present. Indeed, as regards individuals, the title is necessarily relative, the same person being progressive in regard to those he leaves behind, and conservative compared with those more advanced whom he does not choose to follow. The new views thus gradually adopted owe their origin so far almost entirely to the rationalistic school, from which they were borrowed by the more advanced, and gradually came to be accepted by the more conservative section of Protestants. It is mostly through the writings of the latter that they have gained recognitiou among Catholics. Their Catholic adherents are chiefly to be found among Biblical students, the opposite tendency being commonly represented by theologians. This means that the general principles of theology seem to lead in one direction and the facts in another. The principles have been forcibly recalled by Leo XIII. in his recent Encyclical; yet it is a remarkable fact that our Biblical students, while professing the most entire submission to his teachings, have never been bolder in their speculations and in the handling of what had hitherto been looked upon in the Bible as literal history, than since

the Encyclical was issued. Thus, to confine ourselves to a few examples, the freedom of interpretation generally admitted already with regard to the first chapter of Genesis is now claimed and practically assumed in dealing with the contents of the ten following chapters. The deluge, in particular, whose waters are said, in the narrative of Genesis, to have covered the whole face of the earth and risen fifteen cubits above all the high mountains under the heavens, is reduced to the proportions of a local inundation swallowing up only a portion of animal or even of human life. In the same way the plagues of Egypt are cut down by some to the size of ordinary events providentially disposed to subserve a divine purpose; the miracle of Josue to a poetic description of a natural phenomenon, etc. In a word what assumes a historical form in the Bible is admitted in one case as a true record of facts, in another as a conventional or fanciful presentation of what happened, in another again as a fiction destined, like the parables of the Gospel, to embody and convey some salutary truth. There are those who to the last category assign such books as Job, Judith, Tobias, to which some are half disposed to add Jonas. Several are quite ready to admit different narratives of the same event, which, read literally, cannot be reconciled, and even "duplicates" or double narratives of the same fact, in the same book, which cannot be adjusted together.

Finally the date and authorship of the books of the Old and the New Testament they look upon as open to free discussion and bound to stand on their own merits. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, almost universally rejected by the highest Biblical authorities, and even by many of the most "orthodox" Protestant teachers, is being gradually questioned among Catholic scholars. These are extreme positions and are far from winning the approval of all; yet they are openly assumed; they are favored by some of our ablest Catholic scholars; they have been one of the salient features of the last Catholic Congress in Fribourg, and our best known Catholic organs, in England, in France, in Germany, ventilate them freely.

V.

From all this it is easy to gather what an arduous and complicated task is set before the Biblical apologist of the present day. One of his principal difficulties, in a period of transition like the present, is to discern, among the positions held in the past, which he is bound to hold at any cost, which he may abandon if hard pressed, which he should not waste time in defending. In the next place, most of the objections he has to face are the outcome of special knowledge, and can be met directly only by those who have pursued the same lines of study; yet no single individual can compass them all, nor indeed are such studies equally suited to all. To some they bring light and peace; to others they are only a source of perplexity and unrest. Yet so long as they are necessary to meet the questionings of others, they have to be taken up and pursued by those who are in charge of them. The special direction to pursue will naturally be determined by the needs which have to be met, such as they may be learned by direct intercourse with individuals, or gathered from their surroundings, the books they read, etc. Already by his general culture and by his special seminary training, the young priest is able to dispose of most of them. But he has to complete his knowledge and keep abreast of the progressive movement of the day.[1] Just now most things connected with the Bible are in a state of transition and transformation. Scarce is one difficulty answered, or dropped as worthless, when another crops up. New views are set forth in endless succession. It is well to know something of them, but there is no need to be concerned about them. Most of them speedily vanish, and the others may be left to specialists. It is time enough to attend to them when they have got a solid footing among competent judges. Much of what we read in newspapers and reviews of discoveries bearing on the Bible is worked up for sensational effect and collapses as quickly as it has come into notice. To be anxious even about what is destined to remain would argue in the apologist little faith in the cause he defends. Far

from dreading genuine discoveries, he should rather welcome them, with the conviction that all partial truths cannot but tend to elucidate and to sustain fundamental truths, human or divine.

(1) Through the medium of the press one may keep track of the principal things that come to light in connection with the Bible. Most of our Catholic reviews mention them. Since the beginning of the present year they have become a welcome feature in the present periodical. Fuller information will naturally be found in special organs, such as the *Biblical World*, of Chicago University (Monthly), or the *Revue Biblique*, (quarterly) Paris, or again the *Biblische Studien*, of Fribourg.

As regards the older difficulties, the student may be referred to the numerous apologetical works of the last and present century, such as Veith, IV. Vol. of Migne's *Curs. Compl.*, or the recent book of Abbé Vigouroux, *Les lives saints et la critique rationaliste*, or Kaulen (German) *Introduction to the Sacred Scripture.*

One of the benefits of the knowledge thus got will be to rid the apologist of the temptation to substitute wholesale denunciation for facts and arguments. He will learn that if there was a time when assaults on the Bible were made by men whose personal character was such that reference to it was a sufficient answer, and, if individual cases of the kind are still to be met with, they are now the exception. Among our most dangerous opponents he will find men of high principle, sincere, fair-minded, and to whom Biblical science is indebted in many ways. He will learn, too, that it can serve no useful purpose to indulge in indiscriminate denunciation of higher criticism and other lines of study which have led to unwelcome results. All are legitimate in their way, necessary, in fact, for a thorough study of the Bible. They may be used, and are used, for constructive as well as for destructive purposes. But as abuse of them has been common, their applications have to be closely watched.

To conclude. From what we have said it follows that, underlying most of the difficulties with which the Biblical apologist has to contend, is the question of Inspiration. It is as an inspired book, with all that is necessarily implied in this quality, that the Bible has to be sustained. That it is

an inspired book, is an article of faith ; but what is implied thereby has never been defined, nor, perhaps, can it be defined, except by approximation. Hence the controversies which have arisen on the subject in our times, within as well as without the Church. As we have already remarked, theologians generally go in one direction, Biblical scholars in another. The tendency of the former is to widen, of the latter to narrow the effects or necessary consequences of inspiration, and the difference for the apologist may be considerable. Even when all are agreed on certain principles, the same divergencies reappear in the manner of applying them. Thus, even if it be admitted that every statement in the Bible is necessarily true, the question still remains : what is really meant as a statement, and what is not, a question which, with the new views held as to the methods of the sacred writers and not easily disproved, leaves room for an honest difference of opinion in numberless cases.

And, for this reason, and because of all the work that has been done on the Bible in recent times, with results which are no longer seriously questioned, theologians have to acknowledge, however reluctantly, that henceforth much less can be built on the Bible than has been done in the past. This is a consequence which many believing Protestants perceive with dismay. Catholics can afford to contemplate it with perfect equanimity. Their faith is based not on the Bible but on the Church. The living Spirit of God is not in the Bible, but in the Church, and for all time. She may seem to depend on the Bible for her knowledge, and as a fact the Spirit has largely guided and enlightened her through the Bible ; but she is not dependent on the Bible for anything that is essential ; and even if, by an impossible hypothesis, the inspired writings proved to be nothing more than a book of merely human origin, yet in her definitions and in her solemn teaching she would always be divinely led to single out in it and proclaim only what is absolutely true. With this assurance the Catholic student may watch serenely the course of Biblical investigation going on around him. He may share in it to the full extent of his abilities and

mental equipment without any misgiving. He may even venture farther in certain directions than a conscientious and consistent Protestant will dare to go. With his hand held fast in the hand of the Church, he is safe from all danger.

J. HOGAN.

St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass.

MY NEW CURATE.

(*From the diary of an Irish parish priest.*)

(*Continued.*)

III.

A NIGHT-CALL.

IT must have been about two o'clock on Sunday morning, when the house bell was pulled violently and a rapid series of fierce, sharp knocks woke up the house. What priest does not know that tocsin of the night, and the start from peaceful slumbers? I heard the housekeeper wake up Father Letheby; and in a short time I heard him go downstairs. Then there was the usual hurried colloquy at the hall door, then the retreating noises of galloping feet. I pulled the blankets around my shoulders, lifted the pillow, and said: "Poor fellow!" He had to say last Mass next day, and this was some consolation, as he could sleep a few hours in the morning. I met him at breakfast about half-past one o'clock. There he was, clean, cool, cheerful, as if nothing had happened.

"I was sorry you had that night-call," I said; "how far had you to go?"

"To some place called Knocktorisha," he replied, opening his egg; "'twas a little remote, but I was well repaid."

"Indeed," said I; "the poor people are very grateful. And they generally pay for whatever trouble they give."

He flushed up.

"Oh, I didn't mean any pecuniary recompense," he said, a little nettled. "I meant that I was repaid by the extraordinary faith and fervor of the people."

I waited.

"Why, Father," said he, turning around and flicking a few invisible crumbs with his napkin, "I never saw anything like it. I had quite an escort of cavalry, two horsemen, who rode side by side with me the whole way to the mountain, and then, when we had to dismount and climb up through the boulders of some dry torrent-course, I had two linkmen or torchbearers, leaping on the crest of the ditch on either side, and lighting me right up to the door of the cabin. It was a picture that Rembrandt might have painted."

He paused, and blushed a little, as if he had been pedantic.

"But tell me, Father," said he, "is this the custom in the country?"

"Oh, yes," said I; "we look upon it as a matter of course. Your predecessors didn't make much of it."

"It seems to me," he said, "infinitely picturesque and beautiful. It must have been some tradition of the Church when she was free to practice her ceremonies. But where do they get these torches?"

"Bog-oak, steeped in petroleum," I said. "It is, now that you recall it, very beautiful and picturesque. Our people will never allow a priest, with the Blessed Sacrament with him, to go unescorted."

"Now that you have mentioned it," he said, "I distinctly recall the custom that existed among the poor of Salford. They would insist always on accompanying me home from a night sick-call. I thought it was superfluous politeness, and often insisted on being alone, particularly as the streets were always well lighted. But no. If the men

hesitated, the women insisted; and I had always an escort to my door. But this little mountain ceremony here is very touching."

"Who was sick?"

"Old Conroy—a mountain ranger, I believe. He is very poorly; and I anointed him." "By Jove," said he after a pause, "how he did pray—and all in Irish. I could imagine the old Hebrew prophets talking to God from their mountains just in that manner. But why do they expect to be anointed on the breast?"

"I do not know," I replied, "I think it is a Gallican custom introduced by the French refugee priests at the beginning of the century. The people invariably expect it."

"But you don't?"—he asked in surprise.

"Oh, dear no. It would be hardly orthodox. Come, and if you are not too tired, we'll have a walk."

I took him through the village, where he met salaams and genuflections enough; and was stared at by the men, and blessed by the women, and received the mute adoration of the children. We passed along the bog-road, where on either side were heaps of black turf drying, and off the road were deep pools of black water, filling the holes whence the turf was cut. It was lonely; for to-day we had not even the pale sunshine to light up the gloomy landscape, and to the east, the bleak mountains stood, clear-cut and uniform in shagginess and savagery against the clear gray sky. The white balls of the bog-cotton waved dismally in the light breeze, which curled the surface of a few pools, and drew a curlew or plover from his retreat, and sent him whistling dolefully, and beating the heavy air, as he swept towards mountain or lake. After half an hour's walking, painful to me, the ground gently rose, and down in the hollow, a nest of poplars hid from the western gales. I took Father Letheby through a secret path in the plantation. We rested a little while, and talked of many things. Then we followed a tiny path, strewn with withered pine needles, and which cut upward through the hill. We passed from the shelter of the trees, and stood on the brow of a high declivity. I never

saw such surprise in a human face before, and such delight. Like summer clouds sweeping over, and dappling a meadow, sensations of wonder and ecstacy rolled visibly across his fine mobile features. Then, he turned, and said, as if not quite sure of himself:

"*Why! 'tis the sea!*"

So it was. God's own sea, and his retreat, where men come but seldom, and then at their peril. There the great ball-room of the winds and spirits stretched before us, to-day as smooth as if waxed and polished, and it was tesselated with bands of blue, and green and purple, at the far horizon line, where down through a deep mine shaft in the clouds, the hidden sun was making a silent glory. It was a dead sea, if you will. No gleam of sail, near or afar, lit up its loneliness. No flash of sea bird, poised for its prey, or beating slowly over the desolate waste, broke the heavy dulness that lay upon the breast of the deep. The sky stooped down and blackened the still waters; and anear, beneath the cliff on which we were standing, a faint fringe of foam alone was proof that the sea still lived, though its face was rigid and its voice was stilled, as of the dead.

Father Letheby continued gazing in silence over the solemn scene for some time. Then lifting his hat he said aloud:—

"Mirabiles elationes maris;
Mirabilis in altis Dominus!"

"Not very many 'upliftings' to-day," I replied. "You see our great friend at a disadvantage. But you know she has moods: and you will like her."

"Like her!" he replied. "It is not liking. It is worship. Some kind of Pantheism which I cannot explain. Nowhere, are the loneliness and grandeur of God so manifested. Mind, I don't quite sympathize with that comparison of St. Augustine's where he detects a resemblance between yon spectra of purple and green and the plumage of a dove. What has a dove to do with such magnificence and grandeur? It was an anti-climax—a bathos, of which St. Augustine is seldom guilty. 'And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' There's the sublime!"

"It is desolate," said I. "Not even a seamew or a gull."

"Quite so," he replied. "It is limitless and unconditioned. There is its grandeur. If that sea were ploughed by navies, or disfigured by the hideous black hulks of men-of-war, it would lose its magnificence. It would become a poor limited thing, with pigmies sporting on its bosom. It is now unlimited, free, unconditioned, as space. It is the infinite and the eternal in it that appeals to us. When we were children, the infinite lay beyond the next mountain, because it was the unknown. We grew up and we got knowledge; and knowledge destroyed our dreams, and left us only the commonplace. It is the unknown and unlimited that still appeals to us—the *something* behind the dawn, and beyond the sunset, and far away athwart the black line of that horizon, that is forever calling, calling, and beckoning to us to go thither. Now, there is something in that sombre glory that speaks to you and me. It will disappear immediately; and we will feel sad. What is it? Voiceless echoes of light from the light that streams from the Lamb?"

"I hope," I said demurely, for I began to fear this young enthusiast, "that you don't preach in that tone to the people!"

"Oh! dear no," he said, with a little laugh, "but you must forgive my nonsense. You gave me such a shock of surprise."

"But," he said, after a pause, "how happy your life must have been here. I always felt in Manchester that I was living at the bottom of a black chimney, in smoke and noise and fetor, material and spiritual. Here, you have your holy people, and the silence and quiet of God. How happy you must have been!"

"What would you think if we returned," I said, "It's almost our dinner hour."

It was not so late, however, but that I was able to take a ten minutes' stroll through the village, and bid "good-day" to some of my parishioners.

I suppose there was a note of interrogation hidden away somewhere under my greeting for I was told in different tones and degrees of enthusiasm :—

"Yerra, your reverence, he's a nate man."

"Yerra, we never saw his likes before."

"He spakes almost as plain and common as yourself."

"They say, your reverence, that he's the son of a jook."

Some old cronies, who retained a lingering gratitude for Father Laverty's snuff, diluted their enthusiasm a little.

"He is, indeed, a rale nice man. But God be with poor Father Tom wherever he is. Sure 'twas he was kind to the poor."

There was a deputation of young men, waiting at my house. I have been pestered from deputations and speeches since the Land League. A shaggy giant stepped forward and said :—

"We have presumed, your reverence, to call upon you to ascertain, whether you'd be agreeable to our, what I may call—unanimous intintion of asking the new cojutor to be prisident of the Gaelic association of Kilronan, called the 'Holy Terrors.'"

I said I was agreeable to anything they wished : and Father Letheby became president of the "Holy Terrors."

After dinner something put me into better humor. I suppose it was the mountain mutton, for there's nothing like it in Ireland—mutton raised on limestone land, where the grass is as tender to the lips of the sheep, as the sheep to the lips of men. I thought I had an excellent opportunity of eliciting my curate's proficiency in his classics. With a certain amount of timidity, for you never know when you are treading on a volcano with these young men, I drew the subject around. I have a way of talking enigmatically, which never fails, however, to conceal my meaning. And after a few clever passes, I said, demurely, drawing out my faded and yellow translation, made nearly thirty years ago :

"I was once interested in other things. Here is a little weak translation I once made of a piece of Greek poetry,

with which you are quite familiar. Ah me! I had great notions at the time, ideas of corresponding with classical journals, and, perhaps, sooner or later, of editing a classic myself. But 'cui bono?' paralyzed everything. That fatal 'cui bono?' that is the motto and watchword of every thinking and unthinking man in Ireland. However, now that you have come, perhaps—who knows? What do you think of this?"

I read solemnly:

I have argued and asked in my sorrow
  What shall please me? what manner of life?
At home am I burdened with cares that borrow
  Their color from a world of strife.
The fields are burdened with toil,
  The seas are sown with the dead,
With never a hand of a priest to assoil
  A soul that in sin hath fled.
I have gold: I dread the danger by night;
  I have none: I repine and fret;
I have children: they darken the pale sunlight;
  I have none: I,m in nature's debt.
The young lack wisdom; the old lack life;
  I have brains; but I shake at the knees;
Alas! who could covet a scene of strife?
  Give me peace in this life's surcease?

"What do you think of this? It is a loose translation from Posidippus!"

"It swings well," said Father Letheby. "But who was he?"

"One of the gnomic, or sententious poets," I replied.

"Greek or Latin?" he asked.

Then I succumbed.

"You never heard his name before?" I said.

"Never," said he emphatically.

I paused and reflected.

"The Bishop told me," said I, "that you were a great Greek scholar, and took a medal in Greek composition?"

"The Bishop told me," said he, "that you were the best Greek scholar in Ireland, with the exception, perhaps, of a Jesuit Father in Dublin."

We looked at each other. Then burst simultaneously into a fit of laughter, the likes of which had not been heard in that room for many a day.

"I am not sure," said I, "about his lordship's classical attainments; but he knows human nature well."

Father Letheby left next morning to see after his furniture. He had taken a slated, one-storied cottage in the heart of the village. It was humble enough; but it looked quite aristocratic amongst its ragged neighbors.

IV.

THE PANTECHNICON.

The usual deadly silence of a country village in Ireland which is never broken but by the squeal of a pig, or the clucking of chickens, or a high voice, heard occasionally in anger, was rudely shocked on the following Thursday evening. The unusual commotion commenced with a stampede of sans-culottish boys, and red-legged, wild-eyed girls, who burst into the village streets with shouts of

"Rah! Rah! the circus! the circus! the wild baste show! Rah! Rah!"

In an instant every door frame was filled with a living picture. Women of all shapes, and in all manners of *habille* and *deshabille*, leaned over the cross-doors and gazed curiously at the coming show. The men, too phlegmatic even in their curiosity, simply shifted the pipe from one side of the mouth to the other; and, as the object of all this curiosity lumbered into the street, three loafers, who supported a blank wall opposite my door, steered round as slowly as a vessel swings with the tide, and leaned the right shoulder, instead of the left, against the gable. It was a tremendous expenditure of energy; and I am quite sure it demanded a drink. And I, feeling from these indications, that some-

thing unusual was at hand, drew back my window curtains, and stared decorously at the passing wonder. It was a long van, drawn by two horses, which sweated and panted under the whip of their driver. It was painted a dark green; and in gold letters that glittered on the green, I read the magic legend:—

PANTECHNICON.

"Pan" is Greek for "all," thought I; and "technicon" is appertaining to art. It means an exhibition of all the arts; that is, a gipsy wagon with bric-a-brac, or one of these peep-shows, which shows to admiring youngsters Napoleon crossing the Alps, or Marius sitting on the ruins of Carthage. I let the curtain fall, and went back to my books; but in a moment, I heard the caravan stopping just a few doors below, and I heard my bed-room window raised; and I knew that Hannah was half way between heaven and earth. I have not a particle of curiosity in my composition, but I drew back the curtain again; and looked down the street. The van had stopped at Father Letheby's new house, and a vast crowd surged around it. The girls kept at a respectful distance, whilst the men unyoked their horses; but the boys stood near, in the attitude of runners at a tournament, ready to make off the moment the first ominous growl was heard. The adults were less excited, though quite as curious, and I could hear the questionings over the silence of expectation that had fallen on the village.

"Yerra, what is it?"

"How do I know? It's the place where the circus people live."

"O—yeh! what a quare place to live in? And where do they sleep?"

"In the wagon."

"An' ate?"

"In the wagon."

"Yerra, they're not Christians at all, at all."

Then the men slowly opened the door of the wagon; and took out, from a mass of canvas and straw, a dainty satin

covered chair. A tidy, well-dressed servant, with a lace cap perched on the top of her head, and what the village folk called "sthramers" flying behind, came out of Father Letheby's cottage, and helped to take the furniture within. As each pretty article appeared, there was a chorus of "oh-h-hs" from the children. But the climax of delight was reached when a gilt mirror appeared. Then for the first time sundry boys and girls saw their own dear smutty faces; and huge was their delight. But I am wrong. The climax came when the heaviest article appeared. Great was the curiosity.

"What is it? what is it?" "A bed?" "No." "A dresser?" "No." "A thing for books?" "No."

But one enlightened individual, who had been up to the great house at a spring cleaning, astonished the natives by declaring that it was a piano.

"A pianney? Yeh, for what? A priest with a pianney! Yerra, his niece is going to live wid him. Yerra, no! He'll play it himself."

Which last interpretation was received with shouts of incredulous laughter. What a versatile people we are! And how adoration and laughter, and reverence and sarcasm, move side by side in our character, apparently on good terms with each other. Will the time come, when the laughter and the wit grown rampant, will rudely jostle aside all the reverential elements in our nature, and mount upwards to those fatal heights which other nations have scaled like Satan; and thence have been flung into the abyss?

I was curious to know what Hannah thought of it all. Hannah, too, is versatile; and leaps from adoration to envy with wonderful facility.

"Father Letheby's furniture, I suppose?" I said, when she brought in the dinner.

"I believe so," she replied, in a tone of ineffable scorn, "a parcel of gimcracks and kimmeens."

"I thought they looked nice from here," I said.

"Don't sit on his chairs, unless you have your will made," she said.

"Did I see a looking-glass?" I asked.

"Oh! yes, to curl his hair, I suppose. And a pianney to play polkas."

"It isn't as solid as ours, Hannah," I said. This opened the flood-gates of wrath.

"No," she said, in that accent of sarcasm in which an Irish peasant is past master, "nor purtier. Look at that sofy now. Isn't it fit for any lady in the land? And these chairs? Only for the smith, they'd be gone to pieces long ago. And that lovely carpet? 'Twould do for a flag for the 'lague.' You haven't one cup and saucer, that isn't cracked; nor a plate that isn't burnt, nor a napkin, nor a tablecloth, nor a saltcellar, nor—nor a—nor a"—

"I'll tell you what, Hannah," I said. "Father Letheby is going to show us what's what. I'll furnish the whole house from top to bottom. Was that his housekeeper?"

"I suppose so," she said contemptuously. "Some poor girl from an orphanage. If she wasn't she wouldn't wear them curifixes."

I admit that Hannah's scorn for my scanty belongings was well bestowed. The sofa, which appeared to affect her æsthetic sense most keenly was certainly a dilapidated article. Having but three legs, it leaned in a loafing way against the wall, and its rags of horsehair and protruding springs gave it a most trampish and disreputable appearance. The chairs were solid, for the smith had bound them in iron clamps. And the carpet?—Well, I pitied it. It was threadbare and transparent. Yet, when I looked around, I felt no feminine scorn. They all appealed to me and said:

"We have been forty years in your service. We have seen good things aud evil things. Our faces are familiar to you. We have spent ourselves in your service."

And I vowed, that even under the coming exigencies, when I should have to put on an appearance of grace and dignity—exigencies which I clearly foresaw the moment my curate made his appearance, these old veterans should never be set aside or cast as lumber, when their aristocratic friends

would make their appearance. And my books looked at me as much as to say:

"You're not ashamed of us?"

No, dear silent friends, I should be the meanest, most ungrateful of mortals if I could be ashamed of you. For forty years you have been my companions in solitude; to you I owe whatever inspirations I have ever felt; from you have descended in copious streams the ideas that raised my poor life above the commonplace, and the sentiments that have animated every good thing and every holy purpose that I have accomplished. Friends that never obtruded on my loneliness by idle chatter and gossip, but always spoke wise, inspiriting things when most I needed them; friends that never replied in irritation to my own disturbed imaginings, but always uttered your calm wisdom like voices from eternity, to soothe, to control or to elevate; friends that never tired and never complained; that went back to your recesses without a murmur; and never resented by stubborn silence my neglect—treasures of thought and fountains of inspiration, you are the last things on earth on which my eyes shall rest in love, and like the orphans of my flock your future shall be my care. True, like your authors, you look sometimes disreputable enough. Your clothes, more to my shame, hang loose and tattered around you, and some of your faces are ink-stained or thumb-worn from contact with the years and my own carelessness. I would dress you in purple and fine linen if I may, yet you would reproach me and think I was weary of your homely faces. Like the beggar-maid you would entreat to be allowed to go back from queenly glory and pomp to the tatters and contentment of your years. So shall it be! but between you and me there must be no divorce, so long as time shall last for me. Other friends will come and go, but nothing shall dissolve our union based upon gratitude and such love as man's heart may have for the ideal and insensible.

When there had been time for perfecting all his arrangements, I strolled down to pay a formal visit to Father Letheby. The atmosphere of absolute primness and neat-

ness struck my senses when I entered. Waxed floors, dainty rugs, shining brasses, coquettish little mirrors here and there, a choice selection of daintily bound volumes, and on a writing desk, a large pile of virgin manuscript, spoke the scholar and the gentleman. My heart sank, as I thought how sick of all this he will be in a few weeks, when the days draw in, and the skies scowl, and the windows are washed, and the house rocked under the fierce sou'westers that sweep up the floor of the Atlantic, and throw all its dripping deluges on the little hamlet of Kilronan. But I said :—

"You have made a cozy little nest for yourself, Father Letheby; may you long enjoy it."

"Yes," he said, as if answering my horrible scepticism, "God has been very good to send me here."

Now what can you do with an optimist like that?

"There is just one drawback," I said, with a faint attempt at humor, "to all this æstheticism." I pointed to a window against which four very dirty noses were flattened, and four pair of delighted eyes were wandering over this fairyland, and a dirty finger occasionally pointed out some particularly attractive object.

"Poor little things," he said, "it gives them pleasure, and does me no harm."

"Then, why not bring them in?" I said.

"Oh, no," he replied, with a little laugh, "I draw the line there." He pointed to the shining waxed floors. "Besides, it would destroy their heaven. To touch and handle the ideal, brings it toppling down about our ears."

We spoke long and earnestly about a lot of things. Then, looking a little nervously at me, he made a great leap of thought.

"Would you mind my saying a serious word to you, sir?" said he.

"Certainly not," I replied, "go ahead."

"It seems to me, then," he said, deliberately, "that we are not making all that we might out of the magnificent possibilities that lie at our disposal. There is no doubt

things are pretty backward in Ireland. Yet, we have an intelligent people, splendid natural advantages—an infernally bad government, it is true, but can we not share the blame with the government in allowing things to remain as they are? Now, I am not an advocate for great political designs: I go in for decentralization, by which I mean that each of us should do his very best exactly in that place where Providence has placed us. To be precise, what is there to prevent us from improving the material condition of these poor people? There is a pier to be built. I am told shoals of fish whiten the sea in the summer, and there are no appliances to help our fishermen to catch them and sell them at a vast profit. There is an old mill lying idle down near the creek. Why not furnish it up, and get work for our young girls there? We have but a poor water supply; and, I am told, there is a periodical recurrence of fever. Pardon me, sir," he continued, "if I seem to be finding fault with the ministry of the priests here, but I am sure you do not misunderstand me?"

"Certainly not," said I, "go on."

And he went on with his airy optimism, drawing wonderful castles with the light pencils of his young fancy, and I seemed to hear my own voice echoing back from thirty years long passed by, when the very same words were on my lips and the same ideas throbbed through my brain. But would it be kind to leave him undeceived? I decided not.

"Your first step," I said, "is to see the landlord, who owns the sloping fields and the foreshore."

"Certainly," he said, "that's quite easy. What's his address?"

"I am not quite sure," I replied. "He is probably this moment staking half his property on the red at Monte Carlo, or trying to peep into a harem at Stamboul, or dining off bison steak in some cañon in the Sierras."

He looked shocked.

"But his agent—his representative?"

"Oh! he's quite availabie. He will be very polite, and tell you in well-chosen words that he can do—nothing."

"But the Governmental Office—the Board of Works?"

"Quite so. You'll write a polite letter. It will be answered in four weeks to the day. 'We beg to acknowledge receipt of your communication, which shall have our earliest attention.' You'll write again. Reply in four weeks: 'We beg to acknowledge receipt of your communication, which we have placed before the Board.' You'll hear no more on the matter. But don't let me depress you!"

"But is there no redress? What about Parliament?"

"Oh, to be sure! A question will be asked in the House of Commons. The Chief Secretary will reply: 'The matter is under the deliberation of the Board of Works, with whose counsels we do not wish to interfere.'"

He was silent.

"About the factory," I continued. "You know there is a large shirt factory in Loughboro, six miles away. If you apply to have a branch factory established here, the manager will come down, look at the store, turn up his nose, ask you where are you to find funds to put the building in proper order, and do you propose to make the store also a fish-curing establishment; and then he will probably write what a high-born lady said of the first Napoleon: 'Il salissait tout ce qu'il touchait.'"

"It's a damned lie," said Father Letheby, springing up, and, I regret to say, demolishing sundry little Japanese gim-cracks, "our people are the cleanest, purest, sweetest people in the world in their own personal habits, whatever be said of their wretched cabins. But you are not serious, sir?"

He bent his glowing eyes upon me. I liked his anger. And I liked very much that explosive expletive. How often, during my ministry, did I yearn to be able to utter that emphatic word! Mind, it is not a cuss-word. It is only an innocent adjective—condemned. But what eloquence and emphasis there is in it! How often I could have flung it at the head of a confirmed toper, as he knelt at my feet to take the pledge. How often I could have shot it at the virago, who was disturbing the peace of the village; and on whom my vituperation, which fell like a shot with-

out powder, made no impression! It sounded honest. I like a good fit of anger, honest anger, and such a gleam of lightning through it.

"I am," I said, "quite serious. You want to create a Utopia. You forget your Greek."

He smiled.

"I am reserving the worst," I said.

"What is it?" he cried. "Let me know the worst."

"Well," I said, slowly, "the people won't thank you even in the impossible hypothesis that you succeed."

He looked incredulous.

"What! that they won't be glad to lift themselves from all this squalor and misery, and be raised into a newer and sweeter life?"

"Precisely. They are happy. Leave them so. They have not the higher pleasures. Neither have they the higher perils. 'They sow not, neither do they spin.' But neither do they envy Solomon in all his glory. Jack Haslem and Dave Olden sleep all day in their coracles. They put down their lobster pots at night. Next day, they have caught enough of these ugly brutes to pay for a glorious drunk. Then sleep again. How can you add to such happiness? By building a schooner, and sending them out on the high seas, exposed to all the dangers of the deep; and they have to face hunger and cold and death, for what? A little more money, and a little more drink; and your sentence: Why didn't he leave us alone? Weren't we just as well off as we were? which is the everlasting song of your respected predecessor, only he put it in Latin: Cui bono?"

He pondered deeply for a long time. Then he said: "It sounds sensible; but there is some vile fallacy at the bottom of it. Anyhow, I'll try. Father, give me your blessing!"

"There again," I said, "see how innocent you are. You don't know the vernacular."

He looked surprised.

"When you know us better," I answered, in reply to his looks, "you will understand that by that formula, you ask

for a drink. And as I don't happen to be under my own roof just now"—

His glorious laugh stopped me. It was like the ringing of a peal of bells.

"No matter," he said. "I may go on?"

"Certainly," I replied. "You'll have a few gray hairs in your raven locks in twelve months time—that's all."

"What a hare," I thought as I went home, "is madness, the youth, to leap over the meshes of good counsel, the cripple." Which is not mine, but that philosopher, Will Shakespeare; or is it Francis Bacon?

(*To be continued.*)

ANALECTA.

E S. CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

DUBIORUM VARIORUM SOLUTIO.

R. D. Augustinus Dauby, Sacerdos et Moderator pii Instituti a Sancto Nicolao nuncupati, in Civitate Parisiensi, de consensu sui Rmi Ordinarii, sequentium dubiorum solutionem a Sacra Rituum Congregatione humillime expetivit, nimirum:

I. Quoad genuflexiones faciendas a ministro Missae privatae, quae iusta de causa et praevia licentia celebretur in Altari expositionis SSmi Sacramenti, quaeritur:

1. Minister, qui transfert missale a cornu Epistolae ad cornu Evangelii et genuflectit in plano ante medium Altaris, debetne etiam genuflectere in accessu ad cornu Altaris et recessu?

2. Quando idem minister ad offertorium et purificationem ascendit ad Altare et descendit, ubinam genuflectere debet?

Et Sacra Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibusque accurate perpensis, rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. quoad primam questionem: Unicam genuflexionem esse faciendam in plano ante medium Altaris; quoad alteram quaestionem: Tam ante ascensionem ad Altare, quam post descensionem de eodem in plano genuflexionem esse faciendam.

II. Rubricae Missalis ad titulum *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae V.*, *n. 6*, praescribunt: "*Si in altari fuerit tabernaculum SSmi Sacramenti, accepto thuribulo, antequam incipiat incensationem, genuflectit, quod item facit quotiescumque transit ante medium altaris*"; quaeritur: Utrum etiam in Missa privata debeat Sacerdos genuflectere:

1. quando defectu ministri, ipse transfert Missale a cornu Epistolae ad cornu Evangelii, et vicissim ;

2. quando in Maiori Hebdomada transit a cornu Epistolae ad cornu Evangelii ad legendam Passionem ?

Ad II. Negative ad utrumque.

III. Rituale Romanum in tit. *Ordo ministrandi Sacram Communionem*, haec habet : "*Sacerdos reversus ad altare dicere poterit : O sacrum convivium, etc.*, v. *Domine exaudi, etc. Et clamor, etc., Dominus vobiscum, etc.*"; quaeritur :

1. Utrum istae preces convenienter dicantur, iunctis manibus antequam cooperiatur pyxis et digiti abluantur ?

2. Utrum Sacerdos duas genuflexiones facere debeat, unam statim ac deposuit pyxidem super Altari et antequam eam cooperiat ; alteram priusquam, reposita in tabernaculo pyxide, ipsius tabernaculi ostiolum claudat ?

Ad III. Quoad primam partem : Negative et preces dicendae sunt infra ablutionem et extersionem digitorum. Quoad alteram partem : Affirmative iuxta Decretum *in Romana* d. d. 23 Decembris 1862, et praxim Basilicarum Urbis.

IV. Iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum, ad benedictionem impertiendam cum SSmo Sacramento ipse celebrans accipit ostensorium super Altari positum ; sed receptum est, ut Diaconus accipiat ostensorium et porrigat celebranti, qui post benedictionem Diacono tradit super Altari collocandum, quaeritur : Utrum liceat in hac duplici ostensorii traditione ritum servare, qui praescribitur pro feria V. in Coena Domini et in festo SS. Corporis Christi ante et post processionem SSmi Sacramenti ?

Ad IV. Aut servatur ritus a Caeremoniali Episcoporum lib. II., cap. 32, § 27 praescriptus, aut, iuxta praxim Romanam, Diaconus ostensorium celebranti tradere vel ab eodem recipere potest, utroque stante.

V. Licetne aliquid canere lingua vernacula

1. In Missa solemni dum sacra Communio distribuitur per notabile tempus ?

2. In solemni processione SSmi Sacramenti, alternatim cum hymnis liturgicis?

Ad V. Negative ad utrumque.

VI. Iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum in solemni Officio ad nonam Lectionem et in Laudibus Hebdomadarius et Assistentes pluviali sunt induti, quaeritur:

1. Utrum idem fieri possit a principio Matutini?

2. Utrum lectori septimae Lectionis Evangelii homiliae duo acolythi cum cereis accensis assistere possint, durante lectione Evangelii?

Ad VI. Si non adsit legitima consuetudo, Negative et servetur Caeremoniale Episcoporum lib. II., cap. VI., § 16.

Atqua it rescripsit. Die 14 Ianuarii 1898.

C. Card. MAZZELLA, *Ep. Praenestinus, S. R. C. Praef.*

L ✠ S D. PANICI, *Secret.*

Rmus Dnus Salvator Ioannes Baptista Bolognesi, Episcopus Bellunen. et Feltren., Pastorali Visitatione Dioecesana peracta, a Sacra Rituum Congregatione sequentium dubiorum solutionem humiliter expetivit; nimirum:

I. Utrum tolerari possit quod in parte posteriori Altaris maioris Ecclesiae Cathedralis Feltrensis sub gradu candelabrorum non tamen sub mensa, in quodam armario custodiantur libri chorales?

II. Utrum permitti possit ut sub sacrario praedictae Ecclesiae Cathedralis, in quo extat Altare portatile, habeantur cubicula pro habitatione aeditui laici suaeque familiae?

III. Quum dubium ortum sit an Ecclesia S. Rochi antea consecrata et deinceps ampliata, fuerit post ampliationem benedicta, quaeritur utrum eiusmodi benedictio, quae fidelibus saltem admirationem moveret, omitti possit?

IV. Utrum possit tolerari antiqua consuetudo erigendi Altare portatile in Ecclesiis vel Oratoriis publicis, quibusdam occurrentibus solemnitatibus et confluente ingenti populi frequentia?

V. Utrum, extante dubio de privilegio, tolerari possint in domibus privatis fenestrae, quae introspiciunt adiunctam Ecclesiam vel Oratorium publicum, quaeque non absque gravi familiarum moerore et cum magna difficultate claudi possent?

VI. Utrum in Ecclesiis consecratis et non tantum benedictis, ubi nullum extat Altare fixum consecratum vel, si aliquod extabat, hoc per defectum substantialem uti execratum habetur, remanere queant Altaria tantum portatilia?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, referente subscripto Secretario, audito etiam voto Commissionis Liturgicae reque accurate perpensa rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. II. III. IV. et V. Rmus Orator acquiescat.

Ad VI. Quam primum fieri possit, consecretur Altare fixum, praesertim Altare maius, in forma consueta, iuxta Pontificale Romanum.

Si vero Altare fixum consecratum fuit, sed per aliquem defectum substantialem amisit consecrationem tunc, dummodo omnes adsint conditiones requisitae ad novam consecrationem Altaris, haec perfici poterit *ex gratia* per ritum ac formulam brevem, ad tramites Instructionis ab ipsa Sacra Rituum Congregatione apposite tradendae.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 4 Februarii 1898.

C. *Card.* MAZZELLA, *Ep. Praenestinus, S. R. C. Praef.*

L. ✠ S. D. PANICI, *Secret.*

CONFERENCES.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter?

IS HYPNOTISM FORBIDDEN?

Qu. Not long ago I saw a decision given by Rome on the permission of using hypnotism. The question was asked by a bishop from France. As far as I remember, the answer was that it was not forbidden, if no suggestions against faith or morals were passed. Would you be so kind as to give me this decision with date?

Resp. The decisions of the Holy See regarding hypnotism are those which have been given generally about the use of animal magnetism, so-called mesmerism, and the like. As physical means, not in themselves wrong, and used for the purpose of removing physical evils, hypnotism and animal magnetism cannot be said to be absolutely forbidden. Such means become unlawful when the manner in which they are used offends against the moral law, or when the end for which they are used is contrary to moral law, or when they aim at producing effects which lie beyond the domain of nature. In such cases hypnotism is either immoral or superstitious. But in any case—and this is the verdict of experienced men—it is essentially dangerous and should never be advised. The following decisions embody the mind of the Church on the subject:

S. C. S. Officii 28 Julii, 1847, (23 Junii, 1840, 4 Augusti, 1856).

"Merus actus adhibendi media physica aliunde licita non est moraliter vetitus, dummodo non tendat ad finem illicitum aut quomodolibet pravum. Applicatio autem princi-

piorum et mediorum pure physicorum ad res et effectus vere *supernaturales*, ut physice explicentur,—est illicita et haereticalis." Unde arguunt theologi: probabilius immunis est a superstitione qui hypnotismum adhibet ad obtinendos effectus qui saltem probabiliter naturae viribus adscribi possunt. (D'Annibale ii., n. 53; Lehmkuhl i., n. 994 nota; Gousset i., n. 425, etc.; Génicot i., n. 263.)

A STIPEND FOR THE MASS OF THE PRESANCTIFIED?

Qu. May I submit to you the following question: can a priest fulfil his obligation to say a Mass (for which he has accepted a stipend) by the Mass of the Presanctified? And if so, is he safe in calling the Mass of the Presanctified a High Mass, having a High Mass to say?

Resp. He can hardly be said to fulfil his obligation unless the person who offered the stipend knew and consented to the arrangement. The ordinary Catholic who asks to have a Mass celebrated for his intention understands thereby the Holy Sacrifice with the ceremonial completing the daily oblation wherein the Precious Body of our Lord is consumed. This is the general opinion of theologians.

Videtur quod *non*—"nisi stipendium dans in id consenserit; secus enim hic censendus est petiisse sacrum cum omnibus ordinariis caeremoniis peragendum"—(La Croix vi., p. 2, n. 2323; Bened. xiv., De Sacrif. M. iii., c. 16, n. 10), ita arguit Génicot in casu neomystae qui sacrum cum Episcopo celebret (vol. ii., n. 244).

OUR DUTY TOWARD THE LEGITIMATE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITIES.

The Secretary of Pontifical Briefs publishes a letter addressed by the Holy Father to Cardinal Perraud, Bishop of Autun, in which he dwells in burning words upon the false spirit of independence which has invaded modern society,

and which subverts the very foundations of good order in both Church and State. "From the spirit of obedience and discipline springs forth as its natural fruit, that union of hearts and minds so earnestly recommended to us by our Divine Saviour, and so indispensable in these days of centralization, when the enemies of truth employ every means to unite in a revolt against the authority of God and His Church. . . . Let the clergy therefore exercise their zeal in behalf of religion and the salvation of souls, but in such a way as not to seize hold of every novel undertaking independent of the direction of their bishops. Let them be on their guard against the spirit and customs of the age. Let them keep in mind the words of the Apostle: *In omnibus teipsum praebe exemplum*, and the injunction of the Council of Trent: "The clergy, called to the work of the Lord, are to compose their daily lives and habits in such way as to show forth a grave, temperate and religious demeanor, in dress, in manners, in disposition, in language, and in all their relations with others." The document, written in French, is dated February 9th of the present year, and printed in the Roman *Analecta Ecclesiastica* for February.

PRIESTS TAKING THE MISSIONARY OATH IN THE UNITED STATES.

Qu. The interpretation, given in the last number of the AM. ECCL. REVIEW, of the binding force of the oath taken by missionary priests in the United States, shows clearly enough that they may under certain conditions be held to do service in any other diocese of the same ecclesiastical province. But what of a priest who leaves his diocese to enter another in a different province? Must he renew the oath of allegiance to the new bishop? Again, what of priests, who come from a diocese in Europe where they have not taken the oath? Are they obliged to the provisions implied in the oath here, unless they have been made to take it, which I believe is not usually done?

Resp. A priest who leaves the diocese and province for which he took the oath, and who is accepted by any bishop

in another province where the same oath is administered at ordination, is *ipso facto* bound by the oath which he originally took in another province; that is to say, the obligation of the oath is transferred together with his jurisdiction. This is clear from a decision by the S. Congregation given in 1895, June 21, regarding the foreign missions of China and India, wherein the following passage occurs: "Juramentum . . . cum semel penes quemlibet alicujus missionis Praesulem fuerit praestitum, semper in posterum fore in suo robore permansurum; adeo ut necessarium non sit ut renovetur si missionarius ad aliam transeat missionem, alteriusque Superioris fiat subditus: cui tamen testimonium de eodem juramento praestito exhibere debebit." (Cf. AM. ECCL. REVIEW, Jan. 1896, pag. 80.)

As regards priests who have never taken the oath, we should suppose that the principle underlying the whole legislation and indicating the *obligation* of the oath to be invariably *transferred* with the jurisdiction, would imply that its obligation is tacitly *assumed* in this case also, together with all the other conditions under which jurisdiction is assigned to priests who are received into a diocese where the oath is the ordinary accompaniment of missionary faculties. It might avert contention, however, if in such cases the oath were administered by the new bishop before permanent affiliation is made.

GLASS POOR-BOXES.

The safest, cheapest, most profitable, most beautiful.

Visitors to New York will often notice at each of the Elevated Railroad stations, in banks, in a few churches, and in other public buildings glass vessels with a slit in the top and over them a sign reading: *Collection for the Hospitals.* These are the ideal collection-boxes. If you put in a coin you can see it, and so can everyone else. You see how much is in the box and when it needs emptying, without the trouble of sometimes unnecessarily opening it. Everyone sees at

a glance what it is intended for. If there are only a few cents in it no thief will break it. If there is sufficient in it to tempt anyone, it can be opened and the contents removed. If such boxes were placed in all the churches the robbery of poor-boxes would practically be abolished. The priest walking through the church can see each and every box and know when it needs emptying. The sexton or whoever opens it will not be tempted to help himself to some of it, because the priest knows about how much is in it. These glass receptacles are cheaper by far than the wooden and metal boxes now in use, and it is much easier to put a little glass box in place than to cut the floor and put in one of the long metal tubes going down to the basement. The contents of the glass boxes are visible to all, and are reminders of what they are for. A person who has poor sight and cannot read the inscription on the box can see the coins inside. The glass boxes need not be half so large as those of wood or metal. They can be made of all shapes and sizes, and with a little trimming of silver or gilt and a little taste can be made most beautiful, and will be an ornament to the church instead of the eyesore that the present big money receptacles are. J. F. S.

THE "ASPERGES" ON SUNDAYS IN NON-PAROCHIAL CHAPELS.

Qu. There are two priests attached to the church here. On Sundays one of us has to say an early Mass at the parish church and then go to a neighboring convent to duplicate. This second Mass is occasionally, that is, on great festivals, a *missa cantata*. Recently my assistant came home saying that the Superioress of the convent had asked him whether they could not have the "Asperges" on Sundays, as their Mass was the *principal* Mass for them and a good number of people who habitually attended the services in their chapel. As we have to renew the *aqua benedicta* for the convent weekly, I am inclined to comply with the wish of the Mother Superior as reasonable, but doubt whether it is according to the rubrics to have the *Asperges* outside of the parish church. I

know that it can be given before a low Mass provided it is the principal parish Mass.

Resp. The right of giving the *Asperges* in non-parochial churches and public chapels may be obtained from the Bishop, who is to exercise his discretion according to the circumstances which may call for quasi-parochial privileges in places debarred from participating in the parish service.

The S. Congr. of Rites having been asked "an in ecclesiis non parochialibus liceat aquam benedicere, et aspersionis caeremoniam Dominicis diebus peragere?" answered: "Plurimum de prudentia Ordinarii confisa ejusdem arbitrio indulgendum dimisit." (S. R. C. 22 Nov. 1659 in Tornac. n. 2017).

MUST THE BISHOP GIVE THE "ASPERGES" AT THE PAROCHIAL MASS?

Qu. According to the Rubrics the Bishop is not to give the *Asperges* when he celebrates pontifical Mass on Sundays. But this applies only to the solemn Mass, because, as the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (Lib. ii., cap. 31, n. 4) says, the Bishop in that case dispenses the *aqua benedicta* as he enters at the door of the church. Now if the Bishop celebrates a low Mass, which takes the place of the usual *missa parochialis* or late Mass in the parish which he happens to visit, could the priest in such a case give the *Asperges* or must the Bishop do so?

Resp. The rubrics prescribe that the *Asperges* be always given by the celebrant himself, and the S. Congregation has repeatedly declared that this rule admits of no exception on the plea of custom or dignity. (S. R. C. 5 Jul. 1631; 13 Mart. 1649; 12 Nov. 1831, etc., etc.) This applies, however, only to the sprinkling immediately before the Mass, and not to the blessing of the water, which, according to the missal, may be done by any other priest in the sacristy. (Cf. Schober, *Miss. Solemn. et Pontif.* art. vii., n. 6).

THE MANIPLE IN PONTIFICAL MASS.

Qu. Is it essential that the maniple be enclosed in the Gospel book as is prescribed for pontifical Mass, or may it be laid upon a cloth on the altar-steps or kept by an acolyte until wanted?

Resp. Manipulus ad partem separatim ponitur *vel* includitur in libro evangeliorum. (Cf. Bauldry, lib. ii. c. 8, art 2, n. 2.—De Herdt, *Praxis Pontif.* tom. i., n. 95.)

CLERICAL STUDIES.

We receive frequent requests for back numbers of the REVIEW containing the earlier articles on "Clerical Studies" by the Abbé Hogan of Boston Seminary. These articles can no longer be supplied, as the last eleven volumes (*i. e.* from VI.–XVII.) are entirely out of stock and out of print. As the articles have been greatly appreciated everywhere, and have recently been translated into French, our English-speaking clergy will welcome the announcement of their early publication in book form. They will be put forth by a Boston firm, making a handsome volume of about 550 pages, and constituting a permanent library of instructive and methodical procedure in the various branches of ecclesiastical study, an admirable handbook for the student whether he lives in the seminary or on the mission.

A MASTER OF CEREMONIES IN DIFFICULTIES.

Qu. In the consecration of the Holy Chrism on Maunday Thursday the *Pontificale* prescribes that the vessel containing the oil for the Holy Chrism shall be covered with a white silk cover. It also requires the Deacon who carries the vessel from the sacristy to the High Altar, to wear hanging from his neck a clean veil (*mappula*) which is also to be folded around the vessel. The rubric of the *Pontificale* prescribes that the vessel when placed on the table before the Bishop shall be surrounded by this veil (*involutam cum mappula*), and it also prescribes the moment when this veil is to be removed

from the vessel, *i. e.*, immediately after the balm has been placed in the vessel of oil.

My difficulty is regarding the silk cover of the Chrism vessel and the rubric of the *Pontificale* which says "dimissa ei sua serica veste alba, quam antea habebat." 1. Do these words mean that then the silk cover also, *i. e.*, as well as the *mappula* is removed? 2. If so, what mean the words "quam antea habebat?" 3. If not, what do they mean? 4. If they mean, as I have heard suggested, that the silk cover (*vestis*) of the *ampulla chrismalis* is then *put on* the *ampulla*, when should that cover have been taken off?

CAEREMONIARIUS.

Resp. The rubric which gave rise to the above mentioned difficulty is thus stated in the Pontifical: "Tum" (after the balsam is poured into the chrism) "Diaconus . . . deponit mappulam, sive velum de ipsa ampulla, dimissa ei sua serica veste alba, quam antea habebat."

The wording is ambiguous and the sense has been variously interpreted. Martinucci, quoting the Roman practice, says that the silk cover is removed just before the mixing of the balsam. "Post orationes eas ("Deus mysteriorum" and "Creaturarum omnium") Diaconus (ministrans) exuet vestem seu tegumentum album ampullae chrismatis . . . non vero tollens mappulam seu tobaleam obvolutam, deinde aperiet eam seu tollet operculum."[1]

The obvious reason for the removal of the silk cover just at this time seems to be to allow the raising of the lid so that the Bishop may dip out oil with which to mix the balsam. The silk cover is not again replaced during the ceremony. "Completa salutatione (olei catechumenorum) Diaconus ministrans cooperiet ampullam . . . et tradet Diacono qui detulit in chorum; caeremoniarius secum feret vestes quibus ampullae erant convestitae."[2]

His only comment on the rubric in question is: "Diaconus qui attulit ampullam e sacristia, accedat ad mensam (after the balsam has been poured into the chrism) et tollet ex ampulla mappulam qua obvoluta erat, eamque sibi collo reponet."[3]

1 Man. Caer. vi., 14, 125. 2 l. c. 141. 3 l. c. 131.

This practice either regards the clause in question as a mere reference to a previous detail and the sense of the rubric would be that the deacon, after the balsam has been poured into the chrism, removes his veil from the vase, the other veil, *i. e.*, the vase's own silk cover which it had at first, having been already removed; or else construes it into an order not to replace on the vessel the original silk cover ("leaving off which it had before"). The clause "quam antea habebat" is merely explanatory, more clearly distinguishing the white silk cover of the vase from the veil with which the whole was encircled.

De Herdt in interpreting the rubric dissents from Martinucci's practice, nor does he appear to agree with himself. According to him the white silk cover is not removed at all from the vase. "Balsamo reposito in ampullam chrismalem, Diaconus detrahit mappulam de ampulla, *non autem sericam vestem albam*," [1] and again, "ampulla (olei catechumenorum) deposita, caeremoniarius os ejus mox aperit, *non amota veste qua cooperitur*, sicut *haec ab ampulla chrismali etiam non amovetur*." [2] In this he is supported by the *Encyclopédie Théologique:* "Après le Préface, l'évêque met dans le vase du saint chrême le peu de baume et d'huile qu'il avait mêlés ensemble, disant: 'Haec commixtio,' etc. Le diacre qui a porté ce vase du saint chrême ôte l'écharpe qui le couvrait encore, y laissant le petit voile blanc qu'il avait auparavant." [3]

A later comment of De Herdt obscures his clear statement in regard to the non-removal of the silk cover. "Postquam duodecim sacerdotes chrisma salutaverint, et labium osculati fuerint, os ampullae clauditur, *ipsa operitur*." [4] This apparent discrepancy as well as the differences in Martinucci and De Herdt may be explained on the supposition that the cover which the latter had in mind was such that without being removed the lid of the vase could be raised, thus leaving its mouth open and the oil exposed. This is clearly

1 Prax. Pont. iii., 23, 27. 2 l. c. 28.
3 Tome xvi., Rites Sacrés, 2. 4 l. c. 27.

intimated when he says that the silk cover is not removed ("detrahit mappulam de ampulla *non autem sericam vestem albam*") and yet the mouth of the vase is uncovered after the deacon presents it ("Archdiaconus ampullam involutam cum mappula accipit, collocat eam super mensam et ipse vel caeremoniarius *os ampullae aperit*").[1] We may further suppose that, since the lower part of the vase has been enveloped in the deacon's veil, the lower half of the silk cover has been folded up over the top. This would be pushed aside at the beginning to permit the removal of the lid, and, after the blessing was over and the balsam had been poured into the chrism, allowed to drop down and so cover the whole vase. The literal rubric seems to favor this interpretation and might be made to read: The deacon withdraws the veil which enveloped the vase, leaving on it the other, *i. e.*, the white silk veil, which it had before (better perhaps as it was before).

Martinucci, on the other hand, supposes such a veil as must be withdrawn in order to raise the lid and get at the oil.

De Herdt *interprets the rubric*, and is doubtless correct in theory; Martinucci *cites a practice*, which is more convenient and more commonly followed. Individual practice will accordingly be best determined by the shape of the veil.

CAEREMONIARIUS OVERBROOKIENSIS.

THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE FATE OF UNBAPTIZED INFANTS.

We have received a request to reopen the discussion as to whether infants who die without the Baptism of water may attain the Beatific Vision. (Cf. AMERICAN. ECCL. REVIEW. Sept.-Dec., 1897, March, 1898.) To do so would, even if it were to satisfy the writers, hardly be fair to our readers. Each of the disputants has had ample opportunity to state his point

[1] l. c.

of view as to the intrepretation of Catholic doctrine, and any further discussion could only involve a repetition of the old principles, or else drift us into criticism of individual opinions to which every one has his own right, even when they do not harmonize with our own preconceived notions or the *dicta* of accredited theologians. As to the position of H. J. H., outlined in his final "Reply," numerous expressions from capable sources, have come forth to endorse it, siding with him all the more because the stand he took was particularly difficult owing to the generally accepted notions on the subject. One of the contestants—"Scholasticus"—whose criticism of the view of H. J. H. was, as we stated at the time, the most clearly reasoned and strongly supported of all the attacks against the position of the latter, writes to us confessing himself vanquished; adding with a touch of generous good humor: "I trembled, whilst the controversy was going on, at the boldness of the position taken by H. J. H., but now, though he has demolished poor 'Scholasticus,' I feel a keen delight, when I see how cleverly and triumphantly he issued from the battle."

THE LUNULA FOR THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

Many priests find considerable difficulty in harmonizing various decrees of the Sacred Congregation with the generally prevailing practice in regard to the construction of the *lunula*. According to the method commonly observed in the Latin countries the S. Host is caught in a semicircular band of silver or gold resting upon a small foot which can be inserted in the centre of the ostensorium. The plate which serves the *lunula* as a base is likewise of gold, and can be removed so as to collect the particles which may fall from the Sacred Species. The whole is guarded by a cylinder of glass which can be removed.

The more convenient way, however, is that of a glass capsule bound by a double circular rim of gold, in which

the S. Host is enclosed. This arrangement has been considered by many as contrary to the prescribed form, because the Sacred Species is supposed of necessity to come in contact with the glass. But this necessity does not at all exist if the two gold rims on the inside of the glass capsule are sufficiently thick. The Host should, of course, have the proper size so as to rest on the circular band, and should be bevelled to facilitate the gathering of fragments. The following decree of recent date shows this to be the correct view and also that it is not necessary to keep the *lunula* in a separate case.

Dubium.

Quoad usum recondendi Hostiam intra duo crystalla, et absque alia custodia in Tabernaculo illam ponendi.

In plurimis Galliae Ecclesiis atque Oratoriis usus invaluit postremis hisce temporibus Sacram Hostiam, quae in Ostensorio exponenda est, recondendi intra duo crystalla apte cohaerentia, eamque in Tabernaculo reponendi absque ulla capsa seu custodia. Hinc a Sacrorum Rituum Congregatione expostulatum fuit: *An eiusmodi praxis licita est?*

Atque eadem Sacra Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito etiam voto Commissionis liturgicae, ac re mature perpensa, proposito dubio respondendum censuit: *Affirmative;* dummodo Sacra Hostia in dictis crystallis bene sit clausa, atque crystalla non tangat, juxta alia Decreta.

Atque ita rescripsit die 14 Ianuarii, 1898.

C. *Card.* MAZZELLA, *S. R. C. Praef.*

L. ✠ S. D. PANICI, *S. R. C. Secret.*

BOOK REVIEW.

CURSUS LACENSIS: Institutiones Psychologicae secundum principia S. Thomae Aq. accomodavit Tilm. Pesch, S. J. Vol. III. Herder: Friburgi (St. Louis, Mo.), 1898. Pp. XVIII., 551. Pr. $2.00.

LA PERSONNE HUMAINE par l'Abbé C. Piat. Alcan: Paris. Pp. 404. Pr. 7½ francs.

I.

Biologists who follow Weissmann tell us that the physical basis of heredity is "immortal," that the "germ-plasm" which is transmitted along the line of descent is the material basis of specific identity between posterity and ancestry; that variation and differentiation take place through the various grouping of certain ultimate constituents of the "germ-plasm," whilst quite a distinct aggregate of transmitted substance—the "somatic cells"—forms the intermeshing material into which the specific elements become embodied in the individual and which by nutrition are built up into the individual organism. The theory may or may not be true; it may, but most likely cannot, be verified. However, it is a fruitful source of analogy in a higher order of fact and activity—mental and moral—and may serve a purpose here in illustrating the heredity and development of philosophy noticeable in works such as those mentioned above. Works like the "Psychology," by Father Pesch, are the germ-plasm in the history of philosophy. They carry on the specific character of fundamental science from age to age, improving and varying to some extent the essential stock by contact with alien organisms, and by new adjustments to different environments in the lapse of time. Works like those of the Abbé Piat embody strongly marked developments of philosophic thought. They seize upon some special organ of the system and by reiterated use and multiplied adjustments engender a fuller development not only of the special part but of the entire organism, all of whose functionings they strengthen and enrich. They effect variation, which is beneficial, because they aim at no differentiation, which would be destructive. Both classes of works are desirable and necessary for the healthy evolution of philosophy, nor may it be said

that one is more important than the other, for each performs a special work, which has value only when and inasmuch as the doing and the result are kept in harmonious relation with the action and outcome of the other. But dropping the biological analogy, let us examine and estimate the character and bearings of each. In the two preceding volumes of his course, Father Pesch completed his study of physical psychology—both on its analytic and its synthetic side. In the present volume he takes up the second and final part of his subject—that, namely, which he designates as anthropological psychology. The method here, as in the preceding portion, is first analytical. The higher psychic energies in man are first inductively examined. The result leads to a synthetic view of the soul as the source and seat of those faculties. First the intellect is studied in respect to its various categories of objects and operations. Here occasion is had for a very thorough discussion of that important, yet never fathomed, subject—the origin of ideas.

Next the human will is subjected to a similar treatment, the dominant question here being, of course, that of liberty.

The third book is devoted to the soul-life within the organism. The fundamental relations between body and soul having been set forth in the first volume of his course, the author here confines himself to the psychic phenomena which directly emerge from the union of the two constituent principles of man. These phenomena are either forms of appetition, or are but loosely classifiable as lying outside the appetitional category. The exposition of the former group affords occasion to bring in matter, too generally omitted from works of this kind, concerning especially the various temperaments in the human person, the so-called faculty of feeling, and the æsthetic faculty. The two latter powers as distinct energies, the author, of course, rejects. The second disputation of the present book likewise contains questions not usually handled in our Latin manuals, those, namely, which centre in the pedagogical aspects of psychology, the art of physiognomy, the origin of language, etc. The fourth and last book furnishes the proofs for the soul's immortality, its powers, and other endowments in the state of separation from the body. Two appendices, one on psychological materialism, the other, on the final end of man, bring the volume to its close and round off the complete course of psychology.

Surveying these "Institutiones" as a whole, we find in them, as was said above, the hereditary fund of Catholic psychology. The author, however, has throughout presented the traditional elements

in their adjustment to what contemporary research and speculation have discovered. The "germ-plasm" of traditional philosophy is seen with that degree of variation which environment has necessitated, at least in so far as it is practicable to exhibit such in a work whose scope is professedly general.

Amongst the "somatic elements," to use the biological term, distinguishable in the work we might mention the literary structure into which the basal components are built up. The author has here, as in his other works in the *Cursus Lacensis*, departed from the simple, though unclassical, style of scholasticism and when not quoting the masters has adopted a phrasing less terse and direct though doubtless more agreeable to the *emunctae naris criticis*. To those who delight in the straightforward simplicity of Thomistic Latinity, this feature may not be regarded as a perfection. The style, however, fittingly harmonizes with the elevation and breadth of the work, and to many readers will doubtless be more attractive than the rougher diction of the schools.

II.

Turning to the other work at hand, the Abbé Piat's monograph on human personality, we are prepared by the character of the author's other philosophical productions to look for a thorough and timely discussion of his subject. The Abbé Piat, like his illustrious predecessor at the Catholic Institute in Paris, the Abbé de Broglie, whose intellectual and priestly instincts he seems to have largely inherited, is above all things a philosopher of to-day, in the better sense of this term. The follower, as was the master, is fully alive to the importance and necessity of adapting Catholic philosophy to the needs and problems of the actual time. This he conceives is to be done not by a departure from the traditional fund of that philosophy, nor yet by a mere re-presentation or even simple adjustment of the old truths to the new conditions; but by singling out some special part of the established system, and by contact—constructive and destructive—with present systems and methods, and thus by assimilation from without and by increased vigor and flexibility from within, further the fuller evolution of a living philosophy—a philosophy that may not only deepen and enlarge the intellect, but have likewise its direct beneficence on the moral life of the individual and of society.

The author's point of view is unmistakably indicated in the opening paragraph of his introduction. "During the past forty years,"

he says, "society presents a character somewhat strange and in certain respects new. The world has come to trust nothing but experience. Facts are the only authority left standing. What transpires behind the veil of phenomena which make up the universe? Men have ceased to inquire because they have lost the hope of an answer. To the eyes of many of our contemporaries the universe is a system of motions, nothing more. And this new conception of nature has found its counterpart in the moral order, wherein it has wrought a revolution. All the notions that concern man's conduct and destiny have been seized by the root and transformed. Liberty, personality, right, duty, immortality, a future life, God—these are so many words that have lost their meaning, at least their traditional connotation." Then, after following somewhat in detail the transformation of these ontological and moral conceptions, the author tells us the precise subject of his present study. "My purpose is to speak here of personality. This is one of those questions which touch most closely on morals, one of those, too, which have suffered most from the assaults of the positivist philosophy. Books, pamphlets, articles of all kinds have been piled up on this problem, during a half century, and the time has come to examine at what point tradition comes forth sound and safe from the trial to which it has been subjected."

Two opposing conceptions of personality divide at present the philosophical world, the *substantialist* and the *phenomenalist*. The former is as old as psychology itself. It was formulated by Aristotle and developed and refined by the scholastics, though the philosophical mind, ancient and mediæval, did but express in technical phrase the idea that is engendered spontaneously in the intuitive act of every mind. So that here as elsewhere, philosophy has merely set in rigid mould the ordinary data of common sense when it adopted the old Bœthian formula: *naturæ rationalis individua substantia.*

The other conception is of more recent date, at least in its definite contour, and has arisen at once from English Empiricism with its Associationalist theory, Kantism with its doctrine of innate forms, and "from the invasion of the natural science into the science of the soul." In this view, "personality is not a fixed entity, permanent and immutable; it is a synthesis of phenomena that varies with its formative elements, and is continually in process of transformation," (Binet's *Alterations of Personality*, p. 261). "The unity of the ego in the psychological sense of the word," says

M. Ribot, "is the cohesion for a given time of a certain number of states of clear consciousness, accompanied by others less clear, and by a multitude of physiological states which, although not themselves conscious like the others, yet operate as much as they. Unity means coördination."

Between these two conceptions of personality there is evidently the widest contrariety and no hope of conciliation. In the elder psychology the essential characteristics of personality were intelligence, reflection, liberty. Personality was held to comprise a definite hierarchy of powers—intellectual, volitional, sentient and locomotive—to say nothing of the "vegetative faculties." These powers were conceived as emanating from one and the same central source —as the indivisible character of thought and volition attests—and this ultimate basis was termed the essence or substance of the soul, the informing principle of the body, with which the soul is substantially interlocked in the unity of one complete nature and one supposit or person. This was the conception of personality that dominated, and still dominates, the traditional psychology.

"All this world of entities is now supposed to have faded away like a mist before the light of a psychology less fanciful, more severe in its method, more sober in its deductions. There is neither liberty, nor faculty, nor substance say the sages of to-day. Phenomena alone are real. At first there exist as many consciences as there are states of conscience. These states arrange and rearrange themselves according to the law of finality. The groupings are so intimate that there results but one and the same act of perception. The simple combines to form the simple; hence the unity of thought, memory, identity; hence likewise character."

The traditional—the substantialist—notion of personality is founded on the data of consciousness and memory. The new—the phenomenalist—notion is claimed to be built upon facts and inferences supplied by physiological psychology and by pathology. It is the Abbé Piat's purpose to examine the "new facts," and to requestion the inferences, and "to show that the time-honored definition of personality does not disappear before the observations and refined experience of contemporary psychology." With this in view he first calls into prominence the data of consciousness, and proves that they are adequately explicable only on the admission that they are phenomena of an underlying noumenon—a living, indivisible, permanent reality—a substantial personality in the common-sense, as well as the technically philosophical acceptation of the term.

This underlying subject, however, of the inner world of representations is what phenomenalists deny, and precisely because they have ceased to trust the word of consciousness, and will admit nothing but the dicta of outer experience and the rigid interpretations of physics and physiology. These empirical sciences point it is claimed to a multiplicity of "consciousnesses" and consequently to a multiplicity of "personalities" within the same individual. A unity indeed is admitted, but a unity of "coördination" not of "substance." The author follows the phenomenalist theory into this its strongest retreat, the recesses of physiological and psychological pathology. He first classifies the phenomena of "successive doubling of personality"—the state namely in which an individual passes successively from one series of consciousness to quite another so as to be practically at different times two persons, *à la mode* of Jekyll and Hyde. The conclusion from the study of these strange phenomena is that the essence of personality it not altered in the cases, for "the field of consciousness" passes simply through divers modifications. The phenomena of "simultaneous doubling of personality," in which state two utterly different series of consciousness coexist and the individual is practically "two persons" at once, are less certainly established. There is in such cases so much room for deception, conscious and unconscious, both in the subject and in the examiner, that the alleged facts are to be taken with, to say the least, a gentle scepticism. Admitting them, however, the conclusion of phenomenalism is not proven. "Cette division radicale de la conscience, cette sorte de scissiparité de l'être psychologique . . . n'en sera demontrée ; il restera toujours permis de dire qu'il n'y a pas de scission du *moi* normal, mais simplement éclosion d'un *moi* nouveau, sortant, sous certaines influences, des profondeurs de l'âme, à la façon donts les feux-follets s'élèvent d'un même marécage pour se livrer leurs batailles aériennes" (p. 129). We cannot here follow the author in his careful critique of the phenomena which M. Binet has so largely popularized in his *Alterations of Personality*. We must also pass by the intermediate portion of the work, wherein the act of reflection is discussed as a witness, not only to personality, but most particularly to the fact that the hypothesis of transformation is unable to explain the origin of man.

The concluding section of the work deals with "responsibility" as a manifestation of personality. Especially interesting here is the chapter on the facts presented, but inadequately interpreted, by the "new criminology." The author shows that the conditions

underlying responsibility are more complex than was realized by writers on the subject a generation ago; that these conditions—some of which are organic, others purely spiritual, others mixed—forming as they do no necessary solidarity, may be variously decomposed and so disarranged as to vary in large measure the degree of responsibility of certain individuals. He inquires into the causes which bring about the disturbance of mental equilibrium and the corresponding limitations of culpability. Amongst these dissolvents are singled out the continuous abuse of liberty; physical degeneracy, brought about by alcoholism, and by abnormal states of the body conditioned alike by poverty and by riches; the intellectual scepticism begotten of materialistic philosophy, itself at once the cause and effect of a corresponding materialistic social atmosphere; lastly, heredity, or the inherited organic tendencies to certain crimes.

It is in the development of subjects suggested by these terms—subjects wherein centre the facts and deductions of physical science and experimental psychology, as well as the established truths of traditional metaphysics, and which at the same time are pregnant with moral and social importance—that the Abbé Piat shows himself at his best, both here and in his other books. Like his preceding work on Liberty, the present monograph on Personality embodies the "germplasm" of Catholic philosophy. Both works present, however, the traditional philosophy in that variation and healthful development which though implying no transformation of its specific character, manifest the energy of its vitality, the range of its powers, its adaptability to the intellectual and moral environment of the age, and its instinctive assimilation of truths from whatsoever domain, old or new, of research or speculation upon which it may be brought to bear.

Were we to single out one of the "somatic" constituents of the work, we should point at once to the rich and befitting literary tissue into which the matter here, as in the other productions from the same hand, has been woven. There are a certain verve and a directness of expression which harmonize perfectly with the analytic movement of the thoughts, and at the same time a beauty and an elevation which befit the synthetic range of the ideas. As one reads the book, the wish comes spontaneously that it were rendered into English. We believe however the thought would suffer in the process. The cold, matter-of-fact Anglo-Saxon would lend itself but ungraciously and all too ungracefully as a counterpart to the warm and delicately subtle art of the French, and the translator

would needs have to bring to the attempt a familiarity with the subject equal to that displayed in the original. If such a translator is to be found—one that is able to mould the work into an apposite English form—let us trust he may be induced to undertake the task.

F. P. S.

LIGHT AND PEACE. Instructions for devout souls to dispel their doubts and allay their fears. By R. P. Quadrupani, Barnabite. Translated from the French. With an Introduction by the Most Rev. P. J. Ryan, D.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia. St. Louis, Mo. 1898. B. Herder. Pp. 193.

Spiritual directors and confessors who have had troublesome experience with scrupulous penitents will be devoutly thankful for this new translation of Quadrupani's guide through the desolate darkness which ordinarily sets in upon souls striving to gain the higher lights of wisdom revealed by supernatural motives of action. Years ago a version under the title of "Spiritual Consoler" passed current, but the English of it was hardly less irritating than the importunities of scrupulous consciences, and the reader felt at times as if the medicine might prove a worse evil to supersensitive souls than the disease. The present translation is a decided improvement.

The book itself is a treasure of spiritual wisdom, and cannot be sufficiently recommended to those who suffer from scruples, as well as priests who are called upon to direct scrupulous consciences. Its teaching is brief, simple, to the point. It regulates the exterior practices so as to harmonize with the principles of right interior life; it does not neglect the important points of social life, such as conversation, dress, etc., and there is nothing in it of the moralizing, preachy and unnatural style so vexing to the average reader of books which pretend to deal with the exposition of principles of spiritual life. "It is absolutely true that in matters of conscience obedience to a spiritual director is obedience to God."—"A soul possessed of this spirit of obedience cannot be lost: a soul devoid of this spirit cannot be saved."—"Do not fear that your director may be mistaken in what he prescribes for your guidance, or that he does not fully understand the state of your conscience because you did not explain it clearly enough to him. Such doubts cause obedience to be eluded, etc." This is the

style of the book. It is handy, its price, 50 cents, within the reach of any person. Its distribution is calculated to do immense good not only by giving correct notions of perfection and imparting light and peace to troubled consciences, but by relieving directors whom penitents persecute with their visions of wrong, and with whom of all others the confessor can never afford to be angry or testy. We would suggest a flexible binding and round edges for such books, to help the impression of ease which the contents impart, as of a thing that smoothes the way. A friend "without corners" is more likely to be consulted in matters of soul than one that is "queer," applies to books as well as to men.

STORIES OF PENNSYLVANIA: or School Readings from Pennsylvania History. By Joseph S. Walton Ph.D., Professor of History, State Normal School, and Martin G. Brumbaugh, A. M., Ph.D., Professor of Pedagogy, University of Pennsylvania. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company. Pp. 300. (Illustrated.)

It is a commendable idea, especially from the pedagogical point of view, to place before our young people pleasing historical descriptions of those grand elements which constitute the moral strength of our Commonwealth, and which furnish at the same time a wholesome precedent for the perpetuation, by the present and future generations, of public honor and social prosperity. If the child is taught to reverence the guardians of civil libert and to admire the achievements which spring from a virtuous sense of independence recognizing God as the true source of legitimate authority, we may assume that it will emulate the sturdy virtue which secures to posterity the advantages of a well-regulated society.

Pennsylvania, geographically and politically the Keystone of the original States, has traditions which give it a sort of typical importance amid the great complex of the Union. Hence this volume, which as the preface states, comprises "a series of sketches taken chiefly from our unwritten history, but signifying almost every important phase of our growth," might serve as a model for similar manuals for the use of school children in the different States. It tells us in interesting fashion of the coming of Penn, of the Quakers, of the Germans and their schoolmasters, of the Moravians, the Indians;

it describes many incidents of the Revolutionary war, and a hundred details attractive to children, about Light-Horse Harry and Tom the Tinker, and Mary Quinn, and how the cow's tail saved Jane Maguire, and about the Philadelphia Tea Party, together with a host of other things—chiefly religious.

I say "chiefly religious"; though the book is not sectarian except in this that it wholly ignores, with the unavoidable inference of censure, the religious and beneficent as well as patriotic activity of a very considerable portion of the population in Pennsylvania since the Declaration of Independence. In this it follows the policy outlined by Mr. George S. Fisher in his two volumes on the growth of our Commonwealth, and of that "respectable" class of "Friends" who recognize the Nazarenes only to patronize them with the luxury of their well-regulated beneficence and who have imbibed the severe prejudices of their founder against Catholics, together with the lofty aims and gentle manners which give that prejudice the appearance of right. It would not have been difficult for the authors of such a book as this to say what Morris says in his *Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States*, namely, that the Roman Catholic population "contributed largely to the success of the cause of liberty," and her sons "presented the delightful spectacle of working together to support free institutions." If this is true of the Union, it is no less true of Pennsylvania. The members of Congress, the Supreme Executive Council and the Assembly of Pennsylvania in 1781 assisted at the public service in a Catholic church in Philadelphia to celebrate the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. That surely indicates something beyond the fact itself in the way of showing that Catholics were prominently identified with securing of liberty and justice to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. "I presume," said General Washington, not long after, on a memorable occasion when John Carroll and his brothers Charles and Daniel, had presented the homage of the Catholic population to the first President of the new Union, "I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget your patriotic part in the accomplishment of their revolution and the establishment of their government, or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic religion is professed." Apparently the father of our country was wrong in his judgment; at least Mr. Walton and his collaborators know only "four sincere and noble classes that united to build up this Commonwealth," namely, the Quakers, the Germans, the

Moravians, under Zinzendorf, and the Scotch-Irish (Preface). What does the experienced pedagogue who prepares this series of books think will be the effect of the process of exclusion with which we are familiar as being the lot of the followers of Christ from the earliest days of Christianity? The answer is plain to any reflecting mind. The Catholic religion is not one that, in the mind of Professor Walton, deserves to be classed among the ennobling and civilizing elements which edified the Indian and the godless settler, and the best that our friends can do is to say nothing about it, lest the very name contaminate the young minds. That is the bigotry which destroys the value of schoolbooks like the one before us, and which could have been avoided without sacrifice of truth or sincerity by a kindly word about our Catholic fellow-citizens such as General Washington in his answer to the Catholics, or Morris in his history, employ.

We do not know whether the other volumes on the states of New Jersey, Georgia, Missouri, Ohio and Indiana, announced as published thus far, are written in a fairer spirit than the story of Pennsylvania, but we trust that the publishers may exact a full degree of fairness from their writers in future volumes of the series, so that these otherwise excellent handbooks might prove acceptable also to Catholic teachers, who, whilst willing enough to allow the good which the Quakers, Germans, Menonites and others did despite their erroneous interpretation of Christ's teaching, are not disposed to have their religion—which stands the test of logical examination as the unchanged truth of Christianity—ignored, that is to say, themselves ostracized from coöperating in the upbuilding and preservation of a commonwealth founded on Christian principles.

LEZIONI DI ARCHEOLOGIA CRISTIANA, Opera postuma di Mariano Armellini.—Roma: Tipografia della Pace di Filippo Cuggiani. 1898. Pp. xxix, 653.

When, in February of 1896, Professor Armellini fell suddenly dead whilst explaining to his pupils a Greek inscription on the tomb of Pope St. Fabian in the Cimiterio di San Callisto, the loss was felt among students of Christian archæology with hardly less keenness than that experienced at the death of De Rossi. Armellini had, in fact, taken the place of De Rossi in the publication of the monumental work *Roma Sotteranea*, to which he, in conjunction with Commendatore Stevenson and Prof. Marucchi had been called by Leo XIII. after the death of its first author.

His discoveries and interpretations of Christian monuments were in themselves considerable, and the quite large list of his works and monographs constitutes a valuable addition to the store of historic literature in archæology and epigraphy, which has appeared within the last few decades. Armellini began his literary career in 1874 by publishing the history of a newly discovered *graffito* in the Cemetery *di Pretestato* on the Appian way, and shortly afterwards he edited an account of the cemeteries on the Latin way. These were followed in quick succession by numerous volumes and brochures, among which are his history of the Churches of Rome, and an Italian translation of Wiseman's *Fabiola*, with important archæological notes not contained in the original.

But the special interest which attaches to Armellini as a representative teacher of Christian archæology and history is not so much due to his indefatigable zeal and the intelligent care with which he followed in the footsteps of Marchi, Garrucci and De Rossi, as rather to the fact that he was the first among the great archæologists to make the science to which he had devoted his life popular. Hitherto the study had been the exclusive privilege of specialists. But Armellini aimed at impressing young students, and especially ecclesiastics, with the importance of archæological studies as a factor in Christian apologetics. With this purpose in view, although a layman, and one who had already gained a reputation for original research in his special department of study, he entered in 1880 the class of theology at the Gregorian University and obtained in regular course the degree of Doctor of Divinity. At the end of this course in 1884, he was appointed professor of sacred archæology in the Roman Seminary, and in 1889 he took the chair of archæology at the Urban College of the Propaganda. His lectures were extremely popular, not only because of the interesting subject-matter and the known ability of the professor, but also by reason of the edifying piety and reverential affection which he evinced on all occasions for the memory of the martyred saints whose life and death it was his privilege to illustrate. In the present work we have the substance of these lectures ; their publication is due to the care of Sig. Asproni, an intimate friend of the illustrious Armellini. They are printed with scrupulous fidelity in the form in which their author had prepared them, that is to say, not so much finely finished literary productions, as rather definite outlines for the guidance of the student, which the professor used to amplify at pleasure from his vast store of erudition and experience.

Beginning with the early diffusion of Christianity in the world of Judaism and paganism the author shows from monuments and inscriptions what was the condition of the faithful in their relation to Roman society before the time of Constantine. He next examines in detail the Catacombs, because these furnish the principal lights and explanations of the social status of the early Christians. Hand in hand with the historic study of the signs and inscriptions in the Roman cemeteries we are taught their artistic significance, the various branches of iconography, ornamental, symbolic, Scriptural, allegorical and dogmatical. The fourth part of the book deals with the ancient ecclesiastical discipline, the arcanum, the sacramental system, the liturgy of the Mass and the various rites—Latin, Oriental, Roman, Alexandrian and Gallic. This is a most interesting chapter which furnishes abundant means for a defence of Catholic practices, from the ancient use of the liturgical language and chant down to the minute ascetical rules of conventual life as exemplified in our religious houses. The last chapter is entitled *Epigrafia* and deals mainly with the character and form of different classes of inscriptions.

The work deserves to be studied and popularized, and we would recommend it especially to professors of theology and ecclesiastical history as a medium to throw fresh light upon many questions of dogma, church history and liturgy which have been in dispute among apologists of the Christian faith. The book is written in an easy style of Italian and well printed. H.

REGISTRA BAPTISMORUM, MATRIMONIORUM ET DEFUNCTORUM necnon eorum qui Confirmati et prima vice SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento refecti sunt.—Apud B. Herder, Sancti Ludovici, Status Missouri, A. S. 1898.

"Besides the books of account, there are registers of births, marriages and deaths to be kept with scrupulous accuracy. Their preservation and safe custody is of the highest importance. . . . It is dangerous to make records on stray sheets or in note books with the view of transferring them afterwards to the proper register." So are we admonished by Dr. Stang in his excellent *Pastoral Theology*, pp. 310, 311. And to make easy and orderly this keeping of parish records, a series of stoutly bound, well arranged registers has been prepared by B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.

There is the *Registrum Baptismorum*, which besides a number of pages designed for an alphabetical index, contains 200 large pages, each page ruled and worded, with blank spaces for the full registration of five baptisms. Of like size and after the same model is the *Registrum Defunctorum*. The *Registrum Matrimoniorum* follows a similar plan, but has place for only four entries to the page. Each of these registers is marked $2.25 net. A smaller volume is the *Record of First Communions and Confirmations*, price $1.00. For country missions or for those who prefer to have the various parish records within the compass of one volume, a somewhat larger register has been prepared, its different parts modelled on the lines of the foregoing separate records, which sells at $2.50.

Each of the registers mentioned bears the *Imprimatur* of the Archbishop of St. Louis.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF CARDINAL WISEMAN. By Wilfred Ward. In two volumes. London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co. 1897.

(*Fourth Notice.*)

When the storm consequent upon Wiseman's "Pastoral" had been allayed by his "appeal" to the English nation, the Cardinal found his policy once more the object of considerable opposition, especially in his own diocese. The discontent of the older clergy was brought out on occasion of the first Provincial Synod of Westminster in 1852, the decrees of which were almost entirely written by Wiseman himself. The so-called "constitutionalists" wanted Rome to institute a system of appointment of irremovable rectors, practically independent of the Bishop's authority; they wanted that the election of a Bishop should rest with the priests of each diocese, and complaints were sent to the Propaganda against Wiseman's arbitrary exercise of power, his innovations, his indiscretion in coming too prominently before the public and arousing Protestant hostility. The Cardinal, amid frequent bodily sufferings, made every effort to induce the different elements striving in opposite directions to come together, to work each in its own way, yet with full respect for their neighbors. In the autumn of 1853 he betook himself to Rome to explain the state of affairs. Incidentally it may be mentioned that he was present at the Consistory of December 19, at which Cardinal Pecci (now Leo XIII.) was named Cardinal. Everything succeeded. Rome recognized that the

charges against Wiseman proceeded from jealousy and from the habit of "narrow and old-fashioned men" to look upon "his zeal as ambition and his activity as love of power." It was at this time that Wiseman began his tale of "Fabiola," which has taken such a phenomenal hold upon Catholic readers down to our own day.

On his return to England in the spring of 1854, the Cardinal found new troubles and his health became seriously shattered. The days of convalescence gave him an opportunity of finishing "Fabiola" in September. Newman expressed his appreciation of the book as follows:

"My Dear Lord Cardinal:—I have just been reading 'Fabiola' and, as Your Eminence is just now returning, I cannot help sending you a line, which may be taken, if you are so kind, as a sort of greeting, to thank you for the instruction and interest which have attended my perusal of it.

It is impossible, I think, for anyone to read it without finding himself more or less in the times of which it treats, and drawn in devotion to the great actors who have ennobled them.

I trust we shall have 'The Church of the Basilicas' from the same pen, for I do not know any other which can do it."

It was not long before translations of the book appeared in Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Hungarian, German, Danish, Polish, Slavonian and Dutch. In Germany four editions appeared within nine months after the first issue. In 1854, Wiseman went again to Rome for the definition of the Immaculate Conception.

In the meantime the Cardinal had begun to realize that he had overestimated the amount of help in purely missionary work which he had looked for from the religious communities whom he himself had been mainly instrumental in introducing to England. His now famous letter addressed to Father Faber and quoted in the Preface of Purcell's Life of Cardinal Manning, has been taken as a severe arraignment of the regular clergy in England, and the judgment of Wiseman, so beautifully and pathetically expressed in time of his dire need, has been affixed as a note of censure to the wider circle of the religious Orders in general. The application seems to us somewhat at fault, and Wiseman himself appears to have been conscious that in expecting from the different Orders what he might have obtained from the individual zeal of their founders, he calculated with forces drawn into definite channels, as though they were still at large. A religious founder whilst organizing a society is free to extend the scope of the work suggested by his zeal for the salvation of souls. But the energies which he gathers around him

need be directed by a sort of mechanism which he himself constructs according to special needs and special resources, but which when once put in operation may not be tampered with even though it can be demonstrated that a slight change would render it useful for other kind of work. Such changes would, as a rule, weaken the spirit of an Order, lessen the reverence in which every member of an institute holds the letter of this law, and demoralize the body despite individual zeal. Separate Orders were instituted upon separate lines of activity; the attraction which brings to it members is precisely this individuality; to divert the scope, the means and methods ever so little under the plea of doing good to the greater number, is to take away one of the strong impulses of religious life, which arise, like in a narrowed stream of water, from the very concentration of its aim. Hence the reluctance of religious superiors to admit any changes in their constitutions—"sint ut sunt, aut non sint." This, I believe, writing as a secular, should be taken into due consideration when we form our estimate of the attitude of the Jesuits, the Redemptorists and the Passionists towards the plans proposed by Wiseman for the evangelization of the London district. The justice of this view appears at once when we consider the attitude of the Oratorians. Their Constitution, as modelled under Newman's supervision, did not contemplate the taking charge of parishes by their Fathers. He therefore strongly opposed, in the first instance, such deviation from the original rule, as had been proposed by Father Faber, to whom Cardinal Wiseman had appealed. And, in order that Faber might carry his point, the two houses at London and Birmingham had actually to be separated by a Brief of Propaganda, and subsequently the London Oratory obtained a distinct Constitution. Wiseman acted the father alike to both institutes and ever kept them united in spirit; but the readiness with which Frederic Faber had entered upon the generous plans of the Cardinal for the salvation of all his children, knit closer the bond of friendship between these two noble souls, which received touching expression in a letter sent by Faber, some years later, July 15, 1863, when on his deathbed:

My Dear Lord Cardinal: Your Eminence, I know, will forgive my dictating a few lines in answer to your letter. I cannot express my feelings; I know I am not what the affection of the most indulgent of Superiors has painted me. I have tried to be it, but failed. I know that sinner never went to Jesus and Mary with more need of divine forbearance than I do. I bless our dearest Lord for His special grace in not allowing me to go

into His presence drunk with the incense of praise and personal attachment. I have thought myself viler, meaner, and more self-seeking every year, and I go to Him now, not despairing in His mercy, but lost in wonder at the *multitudinem miserationum tuarum.*

There are two things that I may say—first, that my poor heart cannot help leaping up at such a judgment of me from a heart like yours; and secondly, that I most tenderly appreciate the thoughtful affection which provided such a consolation for my dear community. Begging, my dearest Lord Cardinal, the hourly renewal of your affectionate blessing, I remain, your Eminence's loving, grateful and most unworthy servant,

FRED. W. FABER.

We pass over with reluctance the details of Mr. Ward's chapter embodying "some personal characteristics of Cardinal Wiseman." It shows him as seen by men of the most divergent temperament and opposing prejudices, and by children, with whom he was a great favorite. The chapter is really too important and interesting to be adequately noted in a book review, and we reserve its picture for another part of the REVIEW.

About the end of 1856, a new spirit of opposition began to develop in the aggressive movement of what might be called the advanced party among Catholics. Some of the Oxford converts of 1845 had, in conjunction with Sir John Acton, a pupil of Döllinger, founded the *Rambler*, a magazine which in the choice of its topics and contributors soon manifested a spirit fostered "by that great wave of Liberalism which canonized the scientific and critical achievements of the age." The central truth upon which Lord Acton, Mr. Simpson and others who wrote in the *Rambler* dwelt, was the necessity of absolute freedom and candor in scientific, historical and critical investigation, irrespective of results. In this most important principle the writers had the concurrence of Newman, and indeed of Wiseman who occasionally wrote in the same vein for the *Rambler* whilst continuing his articles in the *Dublin Review.* But by degrees it became apparent that the responsible editors of the *Rambler* meant to go further than was legitimate. They assumed an air of disdain for authority, taunted the leaders of conservative thought with inferiority in educational achievements, accused the hierarchy and clergy of obstructing the advancement in modern science among the Catholic population, etc. Wiseman felt it his duty to call a halt. He recognized the intellectual superiority of the conductors of the *Rambler*, but he also recognized that by standing aloof from their less gifted Catholic fellows, and adopting

a tone of contempt in their regard, these writers stamped their action as indulgence in intellectual selfsufficiency rather than a frank attempt to impart to others the advantages of their own superior training. "There follows a double evil. Bitterness and party spirit are aroused, and no actual good result is achieved as a compensation." A good deal of controversy ensued. Finally, at Bishop Ullathorne's suggestion, Dr. Newman induced Mr. Simpson to resign the editorship of the *Rambler*, and he himself assumed the responsibilities of that position, which he held for two years.

(*Final Notice follows.*)

BOOKS RECEIVED.

LES JUIFS Devant les Nations. Le Commencement d'un Monde. Par Ph.—Aug. de Lambilly. Paris: Victor Retaux, 82 rue Bonaparte. 1898. Pp. 223. Pr. 3 fr. 50.

DIRECTOIRE PRATIQUE DU JEUNE CONFESSEUR. Par Alexandre Ciolli. Traduit de l'Italien par l' abbé. Ph. Mazoyer. Tome i.—404; tome ii.—386. *Le même.* 1898. Pr. 7 fr.

LE VENERABLE MICHEL LE NOBLETZ. (1577–1652.) Par le Vicomte Hippolyte le Gouvello. *Le même.* 1898. Pp. 490. Pr. 3 fr. 50.

LES MERVEILLES de l'Arrière-Boutique de Saint Antoine. Par Etienne Jouve. *Le même.* 1898. Pp. 301. Pr. 2 fr. 50.

ENTRETIENS EUCHARISTIQUES et Discours de Premières Messes. Par le P. Jean Vaudron. *Le même.* 1898. Pp. 296. Pr. 3 fr.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE Dogmaticae et Moralis. Auctore P. J. Berthier, M. S. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1898. Pp. 708. Pr. $2.50.

SISTER ANNE KATHARINE EMMERICH of the Order of St. Augustine. By the Rev. Thomas Wegener, O.S.A., Postulator of the Cause of her Beatification. Translated from the French edition by the Rev. Francis X. McGowan, O.S.A. *The Same.* 1898. Pp. 317. Pr. $1 50.

THE MONTH OF OUR LADY under the Patronage of Our Blessed Lady of Victory. From the Italian of the Rev. Augustine Ferron, by the Rev. John F. Mullany, LL. D. *The Same.* 1898. Pp. 342. Pr. 75 cents.

PICKLE AND PEPPER. By Ella Loraine Dorsey. *The Same.* 1898. Pp. 238. Pr. 85 cents.

THE ROMANCE OF A PLAYWRIGHT By Vte. Henri de Bornier. From the French by Mary McMahon. *The Same.* 1898. Pp. 226. Pr. $1.00.

SAINT PETER'S CHAINS, HIS LIFE. By the Right Rev. L. de Goesbriand, Bishop of Burlington. Burlington: Free Press Association. 1897. Pp. 76. Pr. 50 cents.

CAEREMONIALE Pro Missa et Vesperis Pontificalibus ad Faldistorium. Auctore Paulo Saraiva, Apost. Caeremon. Magistro. (Ex *Ephemeridibus Liturgicis* excerptum). Romae: Typis Artificium a S. Joseph. 1898. Pp. 59.

ST. AGNES' HOSPITAL. Ninth Annual Report. 1897. Philadelphia, Pa.

DE EXEMPLARISMO DIVINO seu Doctrina de Trino Ordine Exemplari et de Trina rerum omnium Ordine exemplata. Auctore Ern. Dubois, C.SS.R. Romae: Typis Soc. S. Joannis Evangelistae. Desclée, Lefebvre et Soc. Pp. 324–44–13.

COMPENDIUM HERMENEUTICAE BIBLICAE quod edidit et ampliavit Dr. Joannes Doeller. Paderbornae apud Ferd. Schöningh. 1898. Pp. 64. Pr. mk. 1.20.

HISTORY OF THE ROMAN BREVIARY. By Pierre Batiffol, Litt. D. Translated by Atwell M. Y. Baylay, M. A. With a new preface by the author. Longmans, Green & Co.: London, New York and Bombay. 1898. Pp. 392. Pr. $2.50.

THE PRODIGAL'S DAUGHTER AND OTHER TALES. By Lelia Hardin Bugg. Benziger Bros.: New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1898. Pp. 255. Pr. $1.00.

THE WORLD WELL LOST. By Esther Robertson. *The same.* 1898. Pp. 182. Pr. 75 cents.

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM Graece et Latine critice edidit P. F. Michael Hetzenauer, O.C. Tomus II. Apostolicum. Oeniponte. Libraria Academica Wagneriana. 1898. Pp. 400. Pr. 4 fr. 50.

MANUAL OF BIBLE TRUTHS AND HISTORIES. Adapted to the Questions of the Baltimore Catechism. Together with a Life of Christ from the Four Gospels. Compiled and arranged by the Rev. James J. Baxter, D. D. New York: P. J. Kennedy. 1898. Pp. 211–128. Pr. 75 cents.

LIGHT AND PEACE. Instructions for Devout Souls to dispel their doubts and allay their fears. By R. P. Quadrupani, Barnabite. Translated from the French Introduction by the Most Rev. P. J. Ryan, D.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo. 1898. Pp. 193. Pr. 50 cents.

MARON. The Christian Youth of the Lebanon. By A. v. B. Translated from the German by Miss Helena Long. Second edition. *The same.* 1898. Pp. 107. Pr. 45 cents.

FABIOLA'S SISTERS. A tale of the Christian Heroines Martyred at Carthage in the commencement of the third century. Adapted by A. C. Clarke. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago; Benziger Bros. 1898. Pp. 313. Pr. $1 25.

SONGS AND SONNETS and Other Poems. By Maurice Francis Egan. New, enlarged edition. *The same.* 1898. Pp. 220. Pr. $1.00.

THE ARMORER OF SOLINGEN. Illustrated. Pp. 149. **WRONGFULLY ACCUSED.** Illustrated. Pp. 150. By William Herchenbach. Pr. 45 cents each. *The same.*

THE INUNDATION and other tales. Pp. 161. **THE CANARY BIRD** and other tales. Pp. 160. By Canon Schmid. Pr. 45 cents each. *The same.*

THE HOP BLOSSOMS. Pp. 111. **THE ROSE BUD.** Pp 86. **THE OVERSEER OF MAHLBOURG.** Pp. 88. **GODFREY, THE LITTLE HERMIT.** Pp. 128. By Canon Schmid. Pr. 25 cents each. *The same.*

RECORDS OF FIRST COMMUNIONS AND CONFIRMATIONS. Pr. $1.00.

REGISTRUM BAPTISMATORUM. Pr. $2.25.

REGISTRUM MATRIMONIORUM. Pr. $2.25.

REGISTRUM DEFUNCTORUM. Pr. $2.25.

REGISTRA Baptismorum, Matrimoniorum et Defunctorum necnon eorum qui Confirmati et prima vice SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento refecti sunt. Pr. $2.50. B. Herder. St. Louis, Mo.: 1898.

BEYOND THE GRAVE. From the French of the Rev. E. Hamon, S. J. By Anna T. Sadlier. *The same.* 1898. Pp. 300. Pr. $1.00.

A GUIDE FOR GIRLS in the Journey of Life. From the German of the Rev. F. X. Wetzel. *The same.* 1898. Pp. 105. Pr. 40 cents.

LIFE OF FATHER DOMINIC OF THE MOTHER OF GOD (Barberi), Passionist, Founder of the Congregation of the Passion in Belgium and England. By the Rev. Pius Devine, Passionist. R. Washbourne: London; Benziger Bros.: New York, 1898. Pp. 297. Pr. $1.35.

MANUAL OF TEMPERANCE. The League of the Cross. Second edition, revised and enlarged. By Father James Doogan, O.S.F C., Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co. New York: Benziger Bros. 1897. Pp. 194.

CONCORDANTIARUM UNIVERSAE SCRIPTURAE SACRAE THESAURUS ea methodo qua P. de Raze disposuit suum Concordantiarum SS. Scripturae Manuale, adornatus et tabulis synopticis locupletatus. Auctoribus PP. Peultier, Etienne, Gantois aliisque e Soc. Jesu Presbyteris. Cum Approbatione Superiorum. Parisiis: P. Lethielleux. (Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.) Sm. 4to. Pp. 1238. Pr. $6.00.

THE MISTAKES OF INGERSOLL. By the Rev. Thomas McGrady. Printed for the author by Curts & Jennings, Cincinnati, O. 1898. Pp. 344.

METHODUS DISPUTANDI ad usum Scholasticorum a Congregationis Missionis Sacerdote exarata. Seminarium Kenrickianum apud Stm. Ludovicum. Pp. 15.

THE TREASURE OF NUGGET MOUNTAIN. Edited by Marion Ames Taggart. Benziger Bros.: New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1898. Pp. 231. Pr. 85 cents.

WINNETOU, THE APACHE KNIGHT. Edited by Marion Ames Taggart. *The same.* 1898. Pp. 223. Pr. 85 cents.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FIRST COMMUNICANTS. From the German of the Rev. Dr. J. Schmitt. *The same.* 1898. Pp. 288. Pr. 50 cents.

THE DUMB CHILD and other tales. Pp. 85.

THE BACK LADY AND ROBIN REDBREAST. By Canon Schmid. *The same.* 1898. Pp. 89. Pr. 25 cents, each.

SLOVENSKY KOSTOL v Mt. Carmel, Pa. Napísal Bernhard M. Skulik. Pr. 25 cents.

ESPOSIZIONE DELLA DOTTRINA CHRISTIANA dell' Abbate Bernardo M. Skulik. Pr. 10 cents.

ROZPRAWKI o Religii Katolichiej. Napísal Ks. Dr. Bernard Marya Skulik. Pr. 10 cents.

PAMIETAJ O NAS i Nie opuszczaj nas. Napísal Ks. Dr. Skulik, Milwaukee, Wis. Pr. 10 cents.

Non-Circulating
For Use In Library Only

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.

Non-Circulating
For Use In Library Only

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 08638 5

ACCESSION NUMBER
SHELF NUMBER BS 3 A5 XVIII
AUTHOR Am. Eccl. Review
TITLE 1898
DATE 1948 BORROWER'S NAME DATE RETURNED

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY LIBRARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.

The cooperation of borrowers is requested in the matter of careful handling of the books and in their prompt return.

Books may be kept for two weeks and may be renewed, unless reserved.

If you cannot find what you want, ask the Librarian who will be glad to help you

Further loaning of books, without notification of the Librarian, is not permitted

Accession Number

Shelf Number